

# The Merrill-Palmer Quarterly

Established to further the objectives of the Merrill-Palmer School by presenting material relative to the concerted efforts of numerous professional disciplines toward the advancement of knowledge in the many areas of family living.

## EDITORIAL BOARD

Ralph E. Sloan, *Editor*

Martin L. Hoffman	Ivor Johnson Echols	William W. McKee	D. Keith Osborn
Aaron L. Rutledge	Marjorie D. Sanger	Leland H. Stott	

---

VOL. 2 WINTER 1956

---

## The Merrill-Palmer School Thirty-Fifth Anniversary Symposium

### THE EFFECTIVE FAMILY: TODAY AND TOMORROW

Page

OPENING REMARKS	
James K. Watkins . . . . .	46
PERSISTENCE OF AN IDEA	
Mary E. Sweeny . . . . .	48

### EFFECTIVE FAMILY LIVING TODAY

THE FAMILY IN 1955	
Theodore H. Newcomb . . . . .	50
THE ROLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN CONTRIBUTING TO FAMILY LIFE	
TODAY	
John A. Hannah . . . . .	55
FORCES INFLUENCING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF FAMILIES TODAY—PANEL	
Irma Gross . . . . .	66
Lillian Gilbreth . . . . .	68
Joseph Johnston, M.D. . . . .	72
Paul Rankin . . . . .	73

### SOURCES OF STRENGTH FOR EFFECTIVE FAMILY LIVING

THE INTEGRITY OF OPTIMUM GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT	
Wilton Marion Krogman . . . . .	80
STRENGTH WHICH CAN BE DEVELOPED FROM WITHIN	
Marie I. Rasey . . . . .	84
STRENGTH WHICH CAN BE DRAWN FROM WITHOUT	
Lawrence K. Frank . . . . .	89
DISCUSSION GROUPS ON POTENTIAL RESOURCES WHICH FAMILIES CAN USE	
TO BECOME INCREASINGLY EFFECTIVE . . . . .	93

### WHAT LIES AHEAD FOR EFFECTIVE FAMILY LIFE

SOURCES OF FUTURE STRENGTHS—PANEL	
Lawrence K. Frank . . . . .	94
Muriel Brown . . . . .	95
Martha MacDonald . . . . .	98
Ernest Osborne . . . . .	100
Oskar Stonorov . . . . .	102
MERRILL-PALMER'S POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION	
Pauline Park Wilson Knapp . . . . .	106

## THE MERRILL-PALMER SCHOOL'S 35TH ANNIVERSARY SYMPOSIUM

JAMES K. WATKINS

It is my privilege as Vice-President of the Board of Trustees of the Merrill-Palmer School to preside at this opening meeting of the School's Thirty-Fifth Anniversary Symposium during which the discussions will center upon *The Effective Family: Today and Tomorrow*.

Most of you know that the school is organized to carry out the provisions of a trust under the will of Mrs. Lizzie M. Palmer. I think it fitting on this occasion to read a portion of that will.

Article 9. I hold profoundly the conviction that the welfare of any community is divinely and hence inseparably dependent upon the quality of its motherhood and the spirit and character of its home and moved by this conviction, I hereby give, devise and bequeath all the rest, residue and remainder of my estate for the founding, endowment and maintenance of a school at which girls and young women shall be educated, trained, developed and disciplined with special reference to fitting them mentally, morally, physically and religiously for the discharge of the functions and service of wifehood and motherhood and the management, supervision, direction and inspiration of home.

Here was expressed the broad obligation imposed on those responsible for the organization, operation and management of the school, namely, the improvement of the quality of the motherhood and of the spirit and character of the homes of the community and broadly interpreted, of any community.

In 1920 the discharge of this obligation was commenced. In a very small way initially and gradually over the years it has grown. In general, the activities of the school now are threefold. The first is service to the community, primarily this community, this metropolitan area which was Mrs. Palmer's home. That help is provided in one way by direct service to members of families who seek aid and advice from the School. Then there is direct help in the various cultural activities of this community. In addition, the School serves as a focal point for the efforts of various organizations and institutions having related interests.

The second broad effort of the School is directly in the educational field. Students come to the school and receive training which they take with them and use all over the world. The school supplies leaders

trained in education concerning the problems dealing with family life. Then, too, the school collects and organizes knowledge from various professional groups and transmits it to interested parties all over the world.

The third broad field of the School's activities is one that underlies and supports the service and educational fields — namely an extensive and intensive research program in the particular subjects and problems in which the school is interested.

So, in these ways the school for 35 years has been endeavoring to carry out the obligations imposed by the trust under Mrs. Palmer's will.

As Chairman of this meeting it is my privilege to introduce the speakers. The first speaker this evening is no stranger to many of us because for 20 years she was a member of the staff of Merrill-Palmer School. Miss Mary E. Sweeny is really a most remarkable woman. When you look at her and then consider the scope and the variety and the results of her activities, you can only be amazed that there should be such ability and such tremendous energy in so small a person. I can only sketch in the briefest way some of the things she has done. She has been a grade school teacher and a university professor. She has been a worker with teachers, with parent-teachers associations, with women's clubs — always with emphasis on work with children and with family problems. That work of hers has taken her all over the world. She served overseas in the First World War and was cited for bravery. She served in this country in the Second World War.

She is a most extraordinary traveler. She has worked in China, in India and in practically every country in Europe. In all of those she carries this message of work with children and for children. She is the author and co-author of several books. She holds degrees, both earned and honorary from B.A. to L.L.D. and with all this she has a most friendly and attractive personality.

It is an honor and pleasure for me to call on Miss Mary E. Sweeny.

## THE PERSISTENCE OF AN IDEA

MARY E. SWEENEY\*

A backward glimpse over thirty-five years you can see how long "an idea" can live and grow and what are the prospects for its persistence.

Ralph Waldo Emerson said, "Beware of an idea whose time has come." It is my belief that when Lizzie Merrill Palmer wrote into her will, "I hold profoundly the conviction that the welfare of any community is divinely and hence inseparably dependent on the quality of its motherhood and the spirit and character of its homes" that "an idea whose time had come" was made articulate.

It was no accident that the Board of Trustees and the Board of Directors should have been chosen to serve and should have given their energy, their thought and time, and their influence to its development.

It was no accident that the Boards chose as their first director Edna Noble White, whose foresight, initiative, vision and rare courage could help them to transform an idea into a plan for action; a plan for action into a program for education; a program for education into an institution. An institution where there might be freedom for study, freedom for thought, freedom for experiment, freedom for thinking new thoughts, freedom for exploring untried methods. An institution that accepted the responsibility for translating their findings into action.

Principles, facts, hypotheses are not enough. People must see these principles applied and themselves experiment with them before their human behavior and thinking are influenced. This is especially true in all that has to do with human life at all age levels, with the building of life and the development of enduring human relations.

*The Idea* might not have survived if Michigan State University had not had faith in it and trusted us with the instruction of their senior students — if the University of Michigan had not recognized the validity of "the idea" and given their cooperation both by sending their graduate students for study and in the establishment on their own campus of a nursery school on a level for graduate study — if Wayne University had not given a helping hand when our students had to have basic courses that we did not offer and had not shared the services of their faculty and had detailed their students for study with us.

---

\* Miss Sweeney formerly was Assistant Director of The Merrill-Palmer School.



*The Idea* grew and persisted through the good will, the constructive help and the support given by cooperating colleges and universities. It was scientists like Dr. Lafayette B. Mendell, Dr. E. V. McCollum, Dr. Arnold Gesell and Dr. George Stoddard, Dr. R. E. Scammon and Dr. T. Wingate Todd, Dr. Gruelich and Dr. H. C. Stuart and Dr. Icie Macy Hoobler who shared their knowledge and experience and helped to guide its development.

Through the cooperation of the Detroit and Wayne County Boards of Education and of Health, the Children's Hospital, City Social Settlements and the City's Social Agencies the staff and the students had opportunities to study the problems of the community life in one of the greatest industrial centers in the United States, and how it affected human relations and the character of family life.

My purpose is not to review the past but to assure you that the persistence of an idea was made possible by the sustaining faith and help of a community who believed that "this was an idea whose time had come." You have to look back over thirty-five years to see what it means for an idea to survive the great depression of the thirties, the Second World War and the Korean conflict, and to stand on the threshold of the Atomic Era unafraid, aware of its obligations to the future and ready to assume them.

We are dealing now with a new world and our children are auto-motivated, radio-connected and televised. It is not yesterday that we can turn to, save to learn and become wise, but to today. A today that demands new approaches and techniques, new thinking and new methods, new ways of seeing things, new tolerances, better human relations.

It will require a pooling of all that medicine, psychology, human nutrition, social sciences, education and religion can contribute if we are going to develop, wisely and well, the most sacred thing in the world, the life of the individual — and the most potent thing in that life, satisfying and enduring human relations.

No one has ever been able to measure the dimensions of "an idea", nor to foretell the limits of its horizons, especially when it deals with human life and human relations.

As I look back over the past thirty-five years I know Merrill-Palmer has "come of age" for I have seen "the idea" which it gave to those who studied here being applied in India, in China, in Syria, in Turkey, in the Philippines, and in Europe.

*The Idea* which has given Merrill-Palmer the courage, the strength and the daring to do what it has done will persist if Merrill-Palmer is faithful to it and *The Idea* will continue to beckon, to challenge, to lure to greater service, so that whatever knowledge, wisdom or understanding Merrill-Palmer may have acquired it can share with the children and homes of the world.

## THE FAMILY IN 1955

THEODERE H. NEWCOMB\*

I think you people will not be surprised to learn that I do not intend to give you a gross statistical picture of the changing nature of the American family. I assume that you know, for example, that there are more families in this land of ours than formerly. I assume you know that these families are starting at a somewhat younger age than they used to, are a little bigger, and are lasting about as long as before. I assume you have learned that the changes which have impinged upon American families have tended to disperse the ancient functions of these families so that fewer old functions remain.

I want to turn my attention tonight to some of the things that occur inside of families. If it's true, as we are told, that there has been a general dispersion to other institutions of many of the ancient functions of families, then I suppose this leaves as more important than ever those functions which do remain. Particularly those functions of providing love and security, of providing models for children to follow. I shall direct my attention then to some of the processes that go along within families and I shall turn my attention particularly to certain processes which I shall label – if you will pardon the alliteration – contingency, conformity and communication.

First, I want to say something about what I've come to call contingent love. By contingent love I refer to the use of parental affection as an instrument. "Be good or I won't love you," might be the motto of the kind of contingent love that I have in mind. There are those among students of American society who are concerned about what they think is an increasing tendency for families to be characterized by contingent love. How and why might this be a source of concern? I suppose the most obvious single answer is that if a child feels that he is the recipient of contingent love (and if he feels that way he is very apt to be right to some degree) in one way or another he has been robbed of a certain kind of security. I like to distinguish between what might be called affection security and status security. By affection security I mean nothing more complex than the child's right to feel wanted, being loved simply for *who he is* as distinguished from status security, in which he is recognized or admired or loved for *what he can do*. I'm suggesting that it's a child's right to a sense of

\* Dr. Newcomb is Professor of Sociology and of Psychology, University of Michigan.

being loved simply because of who he is and what I have called contingent love may be a threat to this.

Contingent love affects not only children but also parents. A parent in a family in which contingent love is characteristic is very likely to see himself as a rejected parent. I think the problem of the rejected parent may be as important as the problem of the rejected child. If this is true we have the making of a vicious circle, in which contingent love makes the child feel not loved for who he is and this in turn tends to make the parent feel rejected.

I implied a moment ago that some psychiatrists and students of contemporary society see this phenomenon as a source of concern. Is this tendency increasing? Is it, in fact, at all prevalent? Frankly, I don't know. I suspect however, that families characterized by some degree of contingent love are fairly frequent in the United States. Those of you who are familiar with Dr. Karen Horney's work will know her concern for this kind of situation from her description of "basic anxiety" which characterizes the child who feels himself alone and helpless in a hostile world. If this kind of family situation is rather prevalent, I can make a guess as to why this is so.

As you know, there have been in our society for a couple of decades, particularly the urban middle-class society, the typically small two-generation conjugal family. Sometimes I have said that the typical middle-class urban family in our society might be called a "one-parent, one-child family." If we think particularly of the commuting father, and if we think of the average numbers of children in middle-class urban families, particularly during the 1940's, the caricatured phrase "one-parent, one-child family" is perhaps not so extreme. In such a family, particularly without functions other than the providing of love and models to copy, we tend to have a pattern that sets the stage for contingent love.

In the child's very earliest years everything good and everything bad happen at the hand of this one all-important parent. Perhaps week-ends and evenings there are two of them — at least evenings after the old gentleman gets home and before bed-time. Early, then, the important things of life, whether kicks and cuffs or kisses, tend to be centered in just one or two adults. In the later years of life, in urban middle-class families, there tend to be fewer common enterprises than earlier, so the early relationship with the all powerful one or two parents tends to remain the dominant one. The tendency is for this kind of relationship not to be displaced by others. In a society of families containing only one or two adults who matter, in whom all the good and the bad things of life center, it's no surprise that if the love of this all important parent is withheld, affection insecurity will follow.

I'm inclined to doubt that this kind of phenomena is increasing. Families are becoming a little larger in urban middle-class society. I suspect it's possible that families are doing more things together than before. There are other reasons why we don't need to be concerned, I think, about an increase in the phenomena of contingent love. The influence of places like Merrill-Palmer School is one reason. In our time there have also been those who have been concerned by a trend they have labeled conformity. You who have read David Riesman's recent books are familiar with his distinction between inter-directedness and other-directedness. It's his opinion that contemporary (particularly urban) middle-class society is being characterized increasingly by other-directedness whose consequence is conformity. The other-directed are those who have no adequate internal governors. They find their security is not being different, especially different from their peers. Now if tendencies toward conformity in our society are indeed more prevalent than we would like, what relationship does this have to families?

If there are to be adequate internal governors I think it's almost self-evident that parental standards somehow have to be internalized. The Freudians have given one answer to the question of internalizing parental standards. In my judgment the classical Freudian answer is either inadequate or partially wrong. What happens with internalization of parental standards is a lot more than that the child comes to identify himself with the same-sex parent. Among other things, the child becomes aware of a consensus of the two parents, who happen not to be of the same sex. I'm inclined to put more weight on the child's observation of consensus between the parents than upon the Freudian theories of identification with parents of the same sex. In any event I think there is a relationship, and perhaps an important one, between other-directedness and contingent love. Let me say again that I'm speculating, and don't have any very hard evidence which would be thoroughly confirmatory.

If there is an inner voice to be followed, I think the inner voice must be viewed as one which is worthy and one which is dependable. It's as if the growing child said to himself, "I can't trust *me*, if *me* is a poor thing." How does the self come to be seen as worthy and dependable rather than as a "poor thing"? Among other reasons, if in early childhood the self has been treated by the parents as unworthy and undependable, it's that much less likely to be viewed by itself (the child) as worthy and dependable; I think one reason for which the child comes to look at *me* as unworthy and undependable is the feeling of conditional love. If there is to be an adequate internal governor, standards of parents must be considered — but if the standards of the parents are such that the child views himself as unworthy, he won't think the inner voice is worth following.

Is Dr. Riesman right about the increase in this kind of conformity? I don't know. There are surely, on the present scene, observable indications of what might be called the pooling of personal insecurity by acting just like everyone else. Perhaps the tendency is increasing, as Dr. Riesman thinks. If so, perhaps one reason is that there is a bit of a lag in the effects from the generation or two just past, which, in my opinion, were somewhat characterized by contingent love. You'll remember the epochs in which there were controversies about whether to spank or not to spank. There were controversies about feeding schedules. These controversies have almost disappeared and I think most of us would conclude that it doesn't really matter whether you spank or don't spank and it doesn't matter whether you feed on schedule or don't, provided the child has a warm nurturing sense of being loved unconditionally.

I have used a couple of bad terms in the past few minutes — at least I tried to make them bad words — “contingent love” and “conformity.” Now let me conclude with a good word, although good words are really just as bad as bad words.

I think the following is a pretty good generalization; that where there is a sense of freedom to communicate there is likely also to be a sense of loving and a sense of being loved. Let's assume for a moment that these two do tend to go together. Perhaps you're curious as to which comes first. Well, the answer, I'm sure you can guess, is that it's a hen-and-egg problem. However, while hens come from eggs and eggs come from hens, there's no problem if you're talking about one particular hen and one particular egg. Only one direction is possible if you're talking about one particular hen and one particular egg and I'm going to approach the relationship between communication and unconditional love from this point of view.

Let's begin with the sense of contingent love. I think there's no surprise in the assertion that a sense of being loved contingently, only if one does what someone else wants one to do, tends to erect barriers to communication. It's equally evident that such barriers to communication make it harder than ever to avoid contingent love. I think insofar as there are contemporary American families characterized by what I've called contingent love, it's a vicious circle of communicative barriers that maintains it. You who have had children in their teens have learned, I'm sure, to dread that most awful, to me, at least, of noises made by children, “Oh, you wouldn't understand, there's no use talking.” There's nothing harmful about this noise in itself but to me it's symptomatic of the dread situation in which barriers to communication have arisen. Perhaps such barriers to communication result from contingent love; perhaps they result from over-conformity.

This evening, I've offered a few generalizations. I hope I've offered them tentatively but I think they're not entirely wrong. I'm not a professional “viewer with alarm” and there are at least two considera-

tions which give me sober encouragement. One of these is that American parents are self-critical. They like to ask, "How am I doing?" I've heard family educators who are worried about the fact that American parents are worried and self-critical. This doesn't bother me particularly. These tendencies of American parents to be concerned about parenthood may have only the consequences of a bit of fadism such as "this year we feed on schedule and next year we don't." Perhaps their result will be shifting from one error to another. It can happen, but one has the satisfaction of being pretty sure that we are not in a permanent rut. American parents, middle-class urban parents in particular, I think, tend to look for possibilities of changing things. Another reason I think sober encouragement is justified is that all over this broad land of ours, there are places somewhat like Merrill-Palmer in which information is being gathered. We have the possibility of not continuing in the ruts I've been describing simply because we're seeking knowledge. Places like Merrill-Palmer are going to hold up the mirror and make us look at ourselves and with self-criticism comes the possibility of improvement.

## THE ROLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN CONTRIBUTING TO FAMILY LIFE TODAY

JOHN A. HANNAH\*

Those who planned the program for this symposium have paid a high honor to Michigan State University in inviting me to participate in these significant discussions of the family in the American scene today.

At East Lansing, we recall with a great deal of pride and satisfaction our association with the Merrill-Palmer School, an association with a history running back exactly as far as the history of Merrill-Palmer itself extends. We find no small measure of satisfaction in the fact that Michigan State, then the Michigan Agricultural College, was willing and able to contribute some support to the idea which brought this unique institution into being, and even more satisfaction in the undoubted fact that this association has grown warmer and stronger with the passing years. As a matter of fact, it was Miss Sweeny, then a member of our staff at Michigan State, who sold the Merrill-Palmer philosophy to her colleagues in East Lansing.

As the representative of what must certainly be one of the oldest, if not the senior associate of The Merrill-Palmer School, it is a great personal privilege to bring the greetings of my University on the occasion of your 35th anniversary and the most sincere of good wishes for the continued success of Merrill-Palmer. We have known Miss Sweeny for many years, and like all who have had the privilege of knowing and working with her, we have come to feel a deep affection and a great admiration for her. We have known and worked with Mrs. Knapp for a shorter time, but the time has been ample to develop an equally strong admiration for her as a human being and as a leader and teacher of young women.

There was really nothing remarkable in that early interest of the old Michigan Agricultural College in what was destined to be this highly successful experiment in the area of home economics. There had been a division of home economics at East Lansing, since 1896, and women had been studying in this and related fields for a long time previously. Dr. W. J. Beal, in his authoritative history of Michigan State, tells us that 10 women were studying at Michigan Agricultural College as early as 1870.

\* Dr. Hannah is President, Michigan State University of Agriculture and Applied Science, East Lansing, Michigan.



Actually, we find that advocates of higher education for women in connection with the education of men in the agricultural sciences were speaking out at an even earlier date. The Honorable E. H. Lothrop, in an address before the State Agricultural Society here in Detroit, said this in 1849, six years before the institution in East Lansing was established as the first agricultural college in the world:

"As I have impressed upon those gentlemen who have sons, the importance of educating them thoroughly in the business in which they are destined to follow, let me say a word to you who have daughters . . . educate them in everything that will have a tendency to make them plain, modest, sensible, and useful women, and fit companions for those of our sons who shall become scientific and practical farmers. Teach them that industry is honorable and adds to their charms, and that the domestic circle is to be the theater of their future charm and glory."

We may smile at this description of the woman's role in life, but taking into due account the oratorical style of that day and the fact that more than three-quarters of our people were then engaged in agriculture, we find the germ of a good idea. Certainly it was on the basis of kindred analysis and reasoning that the brand-new land-grant colleges began instruction in domestic science not many years later — about 1870 — and have continued as leaders in the field of home economics from that time forward. We should note especially the emphasis on the role of woman as a qualified partner in the home, as a "fit companion", as Mr. Lothrop phrased it, of her husband who was to be educated for his special mission just as she was to be educated for hers.

This should not surprise us, for the people of a century ago recognized clearly and accepted without question the fact that the family was the basis of our social system, and along with religion and education, was essential to the preservation of our unique way of life. They did not discuss the family in the sociological and psychological terminology we use today, and they did not subject the family to much scholarly scrutiny. But they understood and appreciated its vital importance, possibly by intuition, more probably on the basis of experience and observation.

It is intensely interesting, and wholly apropos in the light of the subject assigned to me tonight, that they were equally clear on the point of the role of education, especially the education of women. It was, in their unvarnished words, to prepare young women to be good wives and mothers. And they were under no illusions as to the kind of education required to fit women for these duties and responsibilities. If you think they advocated "snap courses" or just embroidering and sewing, listen to the courses studied by the young women who went to classes at Michigan Agricultural College in 1870: chemistry, botany,

horticulture, floriculture, trigonometry, surveying, entomology, book-keeping, and others. One may wonder just why subjects such as surveying and trigonometry were considered useful, but it is more important to note that the scientific basis for home economics education at the collegiate level was being laid here in Michigan as much as 85 years ago.

Of course, there has been a tremendous change in the course of study deemed appropriate for women, as the role of women in our society has changed, and opportunities for employment of their talents and abilities outside the home have opened up with the industrialization of our nation. Today we think in the more specialized terms of family relationships, family economics, food and nutrition, housing, textiles, clothing, and related arts, et cetera. The fact remains, as the American Home Economics Association stated not long ago, the science of home economics began as a contribution to the preparation of women for homemaking, and I hope that is still the primary objective.

In the light of that statement then, let us consider the role of higher education as it relates to that mission today and as it should relate to that mission in the future.

First, it will be necessary to come to some agreement as to the role of higher education generally — what it is supposed to do in our distinctive social, political and economic system. That should not be difficult, for it has been the settled public policy since the earliest days that education was intended to serve, not the selfish interests of the individual student, but the interests of society through the individual. The earliest colleges were established to insure an educated clergy to serve a religious people. They soon broadened the scope of their academic offerings to provide education for other professions — law, medicine, pedagogy — not for the sake of the individuals who might benefit personally from such education, but because our society had need of the services of men so educated. That has been the dominant principle of our educational system through our history.

There were, of course, as there continue to be, attempts to give a patrician, aristocratic emphasis to higher education by those who perceived the mission of education to be the preparation of a selected few for leadership of the masses of common people. That was the British system, which some of our people still advocate. That concept was discarded early in our history by people who preferred democracy to aristocracy, who had faith in the ability of common people to reason and make decisions for themselves. They were inspired by the French philosophy of egalitarianism; they believed that one man was as good as another, and that no one class was endowed with the exclusive right to rule and govern all the others.

This is an interesting story in itself, but it has no particular significance in this discussion except for one important fact — in America, education has always been intended to prepare young people to be effective citizens of our democracy, fully qualified to bear the responsibility our system places on each individual to carry his full share of the load, to be a leader or a follower as chance and his fellow citizens may determine.

There are many definitions of education of that kind. One of the best was written by John Milton more than 300 years ago: "I call, therefore, a complete and generous education that which fits a man to perform justly, skillfully, and magnanimously all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war." He was thinking, I believe, of educating the whole citizen — trained and willing to do his full share in good times and bad — in order that the social system under which he lives might survive and be improved.

The premise that each citizen must do his full share demands a correlative premise that each citizen have the *opportunity* to employ his individual talents to the fullest for the benefit of himself and his fellow citizens. This in turn demands some kind of system for fitting people into their proper roles, with no ceilings on their advancement. In this country we have chosen to provide that opportunity through equality of access to education. Fundamentally, that is why education is considered to have a priority of claim upon public revenues; only government itself, acting on behalf of all of us, can insure that equality of access to education through which each individual can develop his inborn talents to the fullest.

Admittedly, the system does not work perfectly; there are still far too many bright youngsters denied access to education by which they, and our society, could benefit. But it works better than any other system ever devised; it has brought about a higher level of educational attainment in this country than has been achieved anywhere; it accounts in large measure for the almost fabulous standard of living we enjoy; it has been paid the most sincere compliments by being copied elsewhere; it is responsible, in large measure, for the advances we have made towards a classless society.

In the light of this shining record of achievement, it is disheartening to hear voices of doubt being raised, to hear some men of learning advocate that we should return to the aristocratic system of education, and other men who pride themselves on their practicality propose that we now place limits on educational opportunity by limiting enrollments in our colleges and universities. Somehow, they have followed a twisted path of reasoning to the point at which they are saying that we can improve education in this country by reducing the numbers who have access to it! This is more than ridiculous; it is tragic. The

security and perhaps the very existence of America depend on more and more education for more and more people in this time when scientific, political, and economic developments come with breath-taking speed, and life grows more complicated day by day.

Do you suppose that higher education of the kind and the quantity available 35 years ago when Merrill-Palmer School was founded, would be adequate for today's needs? What if a ceiling had been placed on college and university enrollments in 1920? Would our people generally be as well prepared to deal with the issues of 1955 as they are today? Let me mention a few of the historic events which have occurred since that time, selecting only some whose impact on family life in America can readily be appreciated:

- 1920—the Nineteenth Amendment giving suffrage to women went into effect.
- 1923—the first successful sound-on-film movies were exhibited.
- 1924—the first woman governor was elected in Wyoming.
- 1927—Lindbergh flew the Atlantic.
- 1929—the stock market crash.
- 1933—there was the bank holiday, the onset of the depression, the end of prohibition, and the inception of the New Deal which was to place new emphasis on social conditions and remedial legislation.
- 1935—the CIO was founded.
- 1939—World War II began.
- 1941—Pearl Harbor and our entry into the war.
- 1945—the first atomic bomb.
- 1947—250,000 television sets were produced.
- 1950—the manufacturers turned out 7,500,000 TV sets.

Think of the many other developments we have seen and shared, more difficult to tie to any specific dates: color movies, and now color television; synthetic fabrics; the increasing use of antibiotics in medicine; the increasing use of synthetic shortenings and detergents; the improvement of home electrical appliances such as dishwashers, clothes dryers and air conditioning. These are but material things without lasting significance, we may say; but are we sure? Is there one that has not had an effect, large or small, on our way of life, on us as individuals, and as families? Would the educational system of 1920, had it been frozen at that level, have made it possible either to produce these things or to cope with them as they came along?

Humanity today is at sea in the midst of a very hurricane of events. In view of the portentous discoveries of the field of nuclear fission, all of us may be in the same boat, despite the superficial differences of race and nationality and ideology which divide us. Two things above all others would be fatal to us in this emergency — to lose our bearings

and to slow down the engines which have thus far held us on course and pushed us slowly forward towards a better day for all mankind.

There is justifiable fear that family life may be one of the early casualties in this crisis; there must be a matching determination to preserve and enhance the values which only family life can contribute. There is no need to list and categorize those values for an audience such as this; suffice it to say that the family is the basic unit of our social system and will continue to be as long as that system survives. Perhaps that should be put the other way around: Our social system will not long survive as we have known and enjoyed it unless the family is protected and strengthened as the basic unit, the major cohesive force giving strength and stability to our social structure. Since education is dedicated to the preservation of that system through the preparation of young people for effective, practicing citizenship, then it follows logically that education has an obligation to strengthen the family tradition on which so much depends.

Does higher education have a contribution to make? We have seen that it does, in general. But what about its specific contributions, actual and potential? First, I would say that our colleges and universities are the natural repositories of the accumulated wisdom and knowledge of the ages, with a responsibility to preserve those values, add to them what they can, and pass them on to the young people who study and learn within their walls.

But a word of caution — education dare not be a sterile, static thing; education must be alive, dynamic, adaptable, if it is to keep pace with events and developments, be ever ready to review, to analyze, to interpret, to reject a great deal of chaff to find a few kernels of truth. The record of higher education on this score has been fairly good and it can give greater service in the future, provided it is given the means and facilities with which to perform its tasks.

Many of the truths that higher education teaches, many of the values it seeks to establish as the values by which young people should live, are the same truths and the same values they heard expounded and defended in their homes. Many of you recall having had the curious experience back in your college days of suddenly recognizing as familiar a premise or a thesis advanced by a professor drawing on the wisdom of the sages, the idea being one you had first learned from your father or your mother in the informal atmosphere of home. Indeed, one of the greatest contributions higher education can make is to reinforce, with citations from the past, the fundamental values such as devotion to the truth, honesty in relations with others, respect for the rights and opinions of others, contempt for intolerance and bigotry, values first taught and first learned in the family circle. Colleges and universities make one of their greatest contributions by

lending the weight of their prestige and authority to certain values at the age when young people are highly impressionable, and by nature are inclined to resent parental influence and to reject all of those things which they, in their new-found wisdom, look upon as embarrassing reminders of their childhood days.

In this sense, higher education is the ally of the family. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that higher education is the follower and supporter of the family here, for the family plays the more influential role and has the more difficult task. It is too late to teach most young people the difference between right and wrong when they come to the campus; all colleges and universities can do is to build on the foundations already laid by the home and the church.

We might go further, and say that it is too late to teach the difference between right and wrong in high school. Indeed, there is a reasonable doubt whether any segment of the educational system should be expected to undertake that responsibility. Home and church are far better qualified. There are many who believe that if we are to cope with such problems as juvenile delinquency and divorce the work will be done, not by the courts, social agencies, and the police, but by the home and by the church.

In this sense, education becomes the auxiliary of the home. I would not even claim equal status for education. The role is one with which education should be well content, leaving it to parents to take the lead, to make suggestions as to how education might be most helpful, to call for assistance where needed with full assurance that such assistance will be forthcoming.

There is an extensive catalog of assistance available. I think first of the magnificent contributions of the home demonstration agents and the 4-H Club leaders to the improvement of the status and stability of American farm families. As most of you know, the home demonstration agents were among the pioneers in the field of family relationships, drawing upon the knowledge and the research of the land-grant colleges and universities for the materials to be employed.

The developments in agriculture constitute one of the marvels of the century; they have not come alone in the increase of production, the improvements of plants and animals, the application of science to work in the barns and fields. Equally impressive, though certainly less publicized, have been the improvements in farming as a way of life. They have come about to a large extent through the selfless efforts of the home demonstration agents and the 4-H Club agents and others who worked with young people. Their program has been education in the finest sense of the definition of education as that which helps an individual grow and develop his talents to the fullest extent possible.

It is noteworthy that the home demonstration agents have had



their greatest success when they appealed to the wife of the farmer in the name of her family, stimulating her pride in her profession, encouraging her to make the home a more comfortable, more attractive, more satisfying center of all farm activities. It is equally noteworthy that those who have dealt with farm youth were most successful when they concentrated upon activities related directly to the family's activities. For the boys there were projects in crop and animal production, machinery operation and repair, electrical wiring — all related to the father's day-to-day activities. For the girls too, there were projects in crop and animal production, but more emphasis has been placed on foods and nutrition, textiles, and home management, all to the end that they might help to improve family life on the farm, both when they were youngsters, and when they would mature and have homes of their own.

These are homely examples, but they serve well to illustrate how education, formal or informal, can contribute to the improvement of family life. As a consequence of this successful demonstration, land-grant colleges and universities everywhere are under increasing pressure to extend services of this kind into the suburban and urban areas. In our own state, a large proportion of the work done today by the home demonstration and 4-H Club workers is in urban and suburban areas, and Michigan State University will welcome a further expansion of its activities in that direction provided adequate support can be provided and maintained.

But, you may properly ask, what about higher education in the areas of on-campus teaching and research? Here, we must admit, the record is not as good. The emphasis has been too much upon the technical aspects of our educational mission, too much upon teaching people how to make a living, too little upon teaching our students how to live satisfying lives. We have tended to overlook that one of the founders of the Michigan Agricultural College, the pioneer, warned more than a century ago that the curriculum should embrace both the practical and the liberal subjects. He gave his reasons well: "Nor should the claims of literature and the arts be neglected, as tending to polish the mind and manner, and give greater lustre and dignity to life."

The home economists share the blame in this matter. They too have tended to forget that their science had its beginning as a contribution to the preparation of women for homemaking and that such is still its primary objective. Under the pressures of desire for professional status, and of increasing opportunities for service outside of the home, they have tended to slight their task of preparing women for careers as homemakers and to concentrate too much upon the preparation of women for careers in industry, business, government and education.



Happily, there is evidence that this trend is being slowed down, if not reversed, that increasing attention is being paid to the job of preparing young women to be wives and mothers. This development is to be warmly welcomed and encouraged.

Fortunately — because this is not a job to be delegated to the colleges of home economics alone, but is one in which all of our educational forces should be engaged — we see a corresponding trend in our colleges and universities away from the strong emphasis on the technological toward restoring the liberal studies to a more prominent place in the curricula. At Michigan State we are proud of our Basic College which has pioneered in the field of so-called general education, believing that it has given impetus to this trend in higher education. We feel that we are awakening and helping other awaken to the necessity of educating whole men and women, trained and qualified to play their roles in complicated modern society. We feel an urgent necessity that this be done immediately if the young men and women in our charge are to be fitted properly to perform effectively as citizens in our democracy.

Certainly, as far as women are concerned, this cannot be done by home economics faculties alone. It is an obligation on the total university. There are several reasons why this is so. First, the home economics teachers and researchers have all they can do to teach the technical aspects of their science. Second, they have only a comparatively few young women as their direct responsibility; in most institutions, by far the largest number of women students are interested in other major areas of interest. These are of slight significance beside the unquestionable fact that the education of women to play their appointed roles in our society entails far more than education in the homemaking and related arts. The day is forever past when it is enough for women to know how to cook and sew and iron and manage the children; the development of television alone would have been enough to bring the outside world and its complicated problems into the home and to demand intelligent attention and action on the part of the homemaker. Gone forever, if they ever existed, are the barriers which shielded women from the outside influences which affect their lives, and those of the families for which they have a primary responsibility.

The educational system which served the needs of our mothers and grandmothers would be woefully inadequate and obsolete today, when a woman is expected to know about politics, and economics, and world geography, and sociology and psychology, to say nothing of art, and music, and household mechanics, if she is to keep pace with the interests and activities of her husband and children. This is an educational job in which the whole university must share; it is a job

which colleges and universities must take into full account as they plan their educational programs and design them to make more effective citizens of our young people.

An equally important reason why this task cannot be left to the home economics faculties alone is that the job of maintaining and improving the status of the family is not one for women alone. There is no intent to disparage the abilities of women to guide and counsel the family, and largely to manage its affairs. Rather, here is the intent to acknowledge that men too bear some responsibility for the welfare of the family, a fact generally recognized by law and in society, but surprisingly overlooked by most educational institutions. Most of them take the naive attitude that while it is necessary to train women to be effective in the family relationships, the needed abilities and skills are acquired by men through some automatic process. We know that this is simply not the case — that the same developments which have brought new pressures and forces to bear on the structure of the family and threaten its status make it imperative that men too be educated to understand and to help withstand them. Men have just as much or more at stake.

What I am trying to say is that it is not enough that women should be trained, in the words of Mr. Lothrop, to be "fit companions" of their husbands, by teaching them something of the skills and knowledge they employ in their daily activities. Men too should be educated to be "fit companions" of their wives and know something of their work and their problems in order to appreciate their tremendous contributions and to supplement them as best they can.

How to accomplish this objective I am not at all sure. Certainly we cannot expect men to take prolonged courses in homemaking — we do well to get them to attend occasional lectures in preparation for marriage and family life. What we need is the development of more common interests, a greater facility in the use of a common language so that each parent will have an understanding knowledge of the daily activities of the other, and the ability to talk about both exclusive and inclusive interests with intelligence and sympathy.

The best device to achieve these ends is to provide a common educational experience in as many fields as possible. This, of course, argues strongly for the increasing emphasis on liberal education which I have been advocating. It argues for the development of the personality as well as the development of talents. It argues for the kind of education which will teach the individual — man or woman — about his proper place in the scheme of things, about his proper relationship with others both in and outside of the home, about his proper relationship to his government, about his responsibilities as well as his rights as a human being. It argues strongly for the combination of

the liberal and the practical in our educational offerings in order to produce graduates who are not only prepared, but anxious and willing, to assume their duties and their responsibilities as effective citizens in our democratic system.

Education of this kind will make its greatest contribution to the preservation of the family as the core of our social structure, and thus indirectly but effectively serve the ends of higher education, which has as its ultimate objective the development of the nearest possible approach to a perfect society.

In this belief, I am encouraged by a statement made once by one of the greatest educators of our times, Charles W. Eliot, the long-time president of Harvard, who left such a lasting imprint upon our system of higher education. President Eliot, who certainly could not be suspected of underestimating the importance of colleges and universities, or of minimizing the significance of the work they do, said: "The security and the elevation of the family and of family life are the prime objects of civilization, and the ultimate end of all industry." Educators at whatever level must be content to agree, and have it so, knowing that whatever contributions education can make to the elevation and security of family life will be contributions to the highest interest, not of this nation alone, but of all mankind, which education is eternally pledged to serve.

## FORCES INFLUENCING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF FAMILIES TODAY—PANEL

IRMA H. GROSS\*

I have selected three economic forces for presentation to you. The first is the impact of living in an era of increasing abundance. Dr. Hannah spoke last night of our "fabulous" standard of living and obviously a standard of living in the material sense is closely related to abundance of resources or lack of them. The second force is the impact of the money economy in which we live and the third, while not really an economic force, is our social concern today for family economic security.

First, some of the implications of living in an era of overflowing abundance. I shall quote you changes in size of family incomes, for I suppose when asked to talk on economic matters, one feels she at least should mention a figure or two. Incidentally, every place you look for such data you get slightly different information; but everywhere you look the trend toward increasing size of income is unmistakable. The reference I used said the U. S. median family income in 1947 was \$2500; in 1954, \$3700. Of course, in that seven-year period dollars fell in value about 20 per cent and to maintain an equivalent purchasing power, the \$2500 income in 1947 would need to be \$3000 in 1954; instead it had become \$3700. Between 1929 and 1953 family income, with dollar values held about constant, went up almost one-third. In addition, families are now smaller than in 1929, even though the decrease in size has currently reversed a bit, which makes the per capita gain in income even greater than the family gain. Everything shows that we have a great deal more to do with than we had.

I think there's no doubt but that we're more comfortable in a material sense. There are positive values in being comfortable but there are also certain disadvantages. Those of you who know more nutrition than I do would agree that only the child of a reasonably well-to-do family is really finicky about his food and that the feeding problems with children come in the wake of abundance. A Finnish graduate student of mine said that when she first came to the United States and saw all the things the people here had in comparison with what the Finnish people had, she thought that Americans must be the happiest people on earth. She stayed over a year and went back

---

\* Dr. Gross is Head of the Department of Home Management and Child Development, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

feeling that the Finnish people had an equal or perhaps greater measure of happiness and satisfaction without the situation of "moreness" in which we live.

On the positive side, what I call the embroidery of life is possible only when we have a little more to do with. The amount of good classical music available on records to everybody today is fantastic. I can't remember the exact amount but the point is, unless the world as a whole, I mean our American world, had a surplus we wouldn't be having this classical music widely available. The same is true of the other arts, though perhaps in less spectacular degree.

Now, a bit about living in this money economy and what it does to families. Obviously, one of the positive effects is that it relates the home to the world immediately. The family is not isolated in an economic sense, and more thoughtful families realize the impact of their handling of money on the national economy. On the negative side, what is living in a money economy doing to our creativeness? We buy things today and we lose the challenge of making — I don't mean that this "do-it-yourself" business isn't a little bit of a way back toward creativeness; but certainly rolling together all the "do-it-yourselfers", you still do not have the amount of making and thinking creatively about developing things that occurred before we lived in a money economy. If time permitted I'd like to speak also of the doubled-barrelled effect of credit, this being able to have things before you can pay for them. Is it affecting family values for better or for worse?

I remarked earlier that many of the things we say today will simply be echoes of what is in the minds of all of you and you can develop the pluses and the minuses there. One further impact of living in a money economy for which you can develop pluses and minuses for yourself, is the urge for women to work and earn money outside the home. We must recognize that in order to get certain material things we must have money today. For example, no matter how clever a woman is in her home, she can't make shoes if her children need them, and yet —!

I'll just touch on the third force, the social concern of society for family economic security. It seems good to me that today fewer old people have to worry about who's going to support them than in the past. I know there are some good Republicans in the audience. If you were a Republican in 1935 you certainly objected to social security. No matter what your political party affiliation today, social security has been widely accepted and I think we've come to realize that it is the responsibility of government if necessary to provide respectable and adequate care for people past their earning power. On the negative side, however, what does it do to people when somebody else takes care of them?

The first two economic forces which I have touched upon so lightly — living in an era of abundance and living in a money economy — probably make necessary more choices than families had to make in the past, so that today we realize more and more that home management is a matter of making choices. Choice-making or decision-making is really the crux of home management. Consciously or unconsciously we decide we will do this or that; or if we don't decide or if the decision isn't really within our hands, how happy are we with the results? It seems to me that decision-making which is thus forced upon us has the value of marking us as free individuals — no small gain. It also can become in this day and age an acceptable, desirable and valuable family activity. It is a mental activity but it can be shared and it can be a means of holding a family together. Being a woman, I perhaps would say also this emphasis on decision-making in the family and on the woman's importance along with the man's in performing it, is one of the means of dignifying the status of the homemaker. That in itself adds to the effectiveness of families.

In summary I would say that it was difficult to pick out a very few economic forces playing upon today's families and even more difficult to balance the positive and negative effects of each. Of course no general balance can be struck. Each one of you will do that in terms of your own experience, your own observations, and your own heirachy of values.

LILLIAN GILBRETH\*

I am very pleased that industry should have been requested to be a part of this symposium and I want to testify that industry creates far more along the lines of a program like this than one may believe. Industry has a far greater stake in the home and the family and what is happening there than is always realized and each year industry increasingly feels the tremendous importance of home and family as an institution, well recognizing that industry creates problems as well as providing some answers to problems.

It is debatable how important productivity is but with so many people in the world needing food, shelter and clothing and an opportunity to express themselves creatively it would seem that industry is right in feeling that productivity is a great and needed activity — that it is a force to be reckoned with. One problem is then, how are we going to have enough of the right people in the right place at the right time to turn out those things which are needed. I feel sometimes that the rest of the world and perhaps some of our own people feel

\* Dr. Gilbreth is President of Gilbreth, Inc., Consulting Engineers in Management.

that industry's whole thought is productivity is on the material side. This is not true — the larger number of right-minded people in management, in capital and in labor alike, are interested in using the resources of nature and of human nature for the benefit of mankind. I think that must be stressed continuously or it would appear that the only motivation back of industry is the matter of producing things and developing people is a matter of materialistic values and not spiritual or non-material values. The very fact that industry raises questions rather than making demands or saying it has the answers I think indicates genuine, broad interest.

Industry faces not only the problem of the number of people which it can have but also the problem of the types of people which it can have. At what age can it have them — how young? At what age must it give them up — how old? How much are we (industry) involved in the problems of seeing that the age of admission and the age of release are as they should be. Are we to have only men or are we to have men and women? If both, how are we to utilize the men and the women and how far are we entitled to go? Should we think in terms of their lives not only in industry but also throughout all of their years — not only their work but their work day and their free time? We know well that anything paternalistic, anything that seems to invade individual or family privacy, anything which seems to follow the workers beyond his or her work place, must be scrutinized very carefully to avoid criticism. Yet we know also, industry cannot achieve as it should unless we get a picture of the larger life and the larger span of time and energy through the years.

One thing concerning us very much is the tremendous amount of mobility in industry these days: the number of people — men, women, families — who constantly are being moved because of job demands. Should we restrict the moving which people do because of some demands of family life, of home life, of security? If there is going to be any type of limitation on participation in industry, who is going to decide what it's going to be, where it's going to be, how long it's going to be? Work itself these days demands that many many people be moved, not once but many times, sometimes for very long distances. One of the very first questions asked a man or woman applying for some jobs is: "Can you go anywhere or must you be in a specific place?"

I have a grand-daughter who moved a great deal, as many children did, because her father's work in the armed services shifted. She and her mother tried to be with him and she said to me: "There is just one thing that I am going to insist upon when I get married. We're going to live in one place and we're going to stay in that place all of our lives." Well, we don't like to destroy illusions of the young but I



thought: "Perhaps you *would* stay there dear, but *what* is to insure that the place would remain what it is." How many of your neighbors *would* stay; how sure are you that the neighborhood will stay? How about all of the facilities that you'll use? Again, you see, we arrive at a question. At the end of the scale, perhaps, *would* a young couple with children take an overseas appointment and go for a long or short stay? Is this a wise thing? When is it a wise thing? Should business and industry make more such opportunities? Should the government make more such opportunities? Should such young people be persuaded to take them?

Some young people one sees in the Orient and other countries seem to profit wonderfully by the experience. They seem to integrate into the community. They seem to know how to give and take with people but in some cases the standard of living is greatly changed. It isn't a bit like ours. You not only don't have to do anything in the line of homemaking or even, in many cases, child care, but you're completely out of step with the pattern if you do it. It's a very insidious conditioning procedure and when the young couple comes back in this country there are some terrible jolts when suddenly the wife is supposed to be a homemaker and a housekeeper actually doing the work. In this situation, not only the wife and husband but the children too must face the problems of adjustment after being waited upon and making demands upon people whose job it was to please the family.

In many consulting firms the big opportunities are for the young man who is willing to go anywhere. Perhaps he leaves Sunday night or early Monday morning and gets back to his work center Saturday morning. He spends most of the day at meetings with his fellow consultants, reporting what he did and getting help. He gets home Saturday night and gives as best he can to the family. No doubt that on Sunday some time is required to pack and unpack and become adjusted to leaving again. One man in a New England state decided that during the years their children were small, that isn't what a firm should ask of its young men. He takes no job where his men cannot get home every night. If you had happened to know someone who had been part of an organization which required much travel and who then joined an organization in which such travel is not needed and if his small son had looked up at you and said: "What do you think? My daddy comes home every single night!" you would feel that perhaps this experiment of making the kind of work that industry can do and the young man likes to do fit together may be profitable.

Yet in another young family you find the boy who is 17 years old and going to college. He has been in 14 schools in 14 different places and has wide contacts and an eager interest in people and events all

over the country. When you ask him if he thinks he is going to like college he says: "Yes, if I can learn to live in one place that long." Again you have another side of the picture, and I present it to you not as an answer but as a force and as a problem.

Transportation is a part of a good many work situations and in a city like Detroit or New York workers may be tired before they arrive at work. People may be tired before they get to work and bring problems with them. Being tired accentuates the many problems they bring from home. They return home not only with the accumulation of fatigue from the transportation but very often with the problems of both work and home. Often, as the hat and coat are picked up, those outside the job — outside the home — problems are waiting there too. The problem is one which has many facets and only if we attack it from the various viewpoints represented here are we going to get some of the answers.

The pressure of life today as we get it in industry is a major problem — this tremendous pressure to get out products which the world wants in the least amount of time. In industry we've always thought first in terms of money. How much does it cost? Next, we think in terms of time. The last thing we seem to think in terms of is energy and this demand that the thing be done in a short time often means a very high expenditure of physical and nervous energy to get the work done. I think intelligent people in industry do try to see that there isn't this tremendous pressure. But in spite of the fact that for years and years management has been doing work simplification studies, how to do work not only more easily but also with more interest and more speed, there are many many places where this knowledge is not used and where, therefore, the pressure could be largely eliminated by a more intelligent use of the information we have. I know many of you have tried out these techniques in the home situation. In fact, the American Heart Association in your own city, working with some fine women from a university, put on a demonstration for people who had heart conditions which is something we're very proud of throughout the country. They showed people how to be able to use their time and energy to greater advantage, to plan better and their pressure is far less.

Another factor has come up only rather recently in industry, the matter of work pace. We always knew that you must not let a machine set a pace which would be extremely fatiguing to people involved but we know now that this must be checked most carefully. Two other concerns I can only mention but they are closely related and the other speakers I'm sure will discuss them. One is the question of what we're going to do about education and training. The other one is the matter of automation, with its very great opportunities if we use it properly.

Development in this direction constitutes a tremendous threat unless we prepare for and know how we are going to use the time and energy which is freed by this project.

JOSEPH JOHNSTON, M.D.\*

In the beginning of my experience in medicine about thirty years ago, a doctor tended to measure such success as he had with patients in terms of improved morbidity and mortality, or the extent to which his efforts to improve nutrition resulted in an improved ability to cope with illness if his patient acquired it. The outcome in bronchopneumonia in infancy seemed conditioned more by the nutritional state of the patient than any other single item. We had little to offer in the way of specific treatment. In one large infants' hospital, in the group under two years of age, in the years 1917 to 1927, the mortality ranged from 232 to 236 per thousand. Dealing with a group of patients from good homes and with good nutrition the mortality in the following ten years was a very small fraction of this, not, we felt as a result of anything we had to offer in the treatment of their specific infections but rather because of their own ability to combat infection that was a function of an adequate nutritional state.

In 1938 chemotherapy became available and our mortality in this group from all infections other than tuberculous fell from eighteen to eight per thousand; three years later with the advent of penicillin a further fall to four per thousand occurred and we have had a single year without a death from bacterial infection. Even in tuberculous meningitis which carried with a mortality of 100 percent, we can now talk in terms of three percent, and the incidence of the occurrence of infection in this community, even in a group of foster home children, has fallen to four percent. Diphtheria, pertussis, tetanus and smallpox remain relatively minor problems of prevention rather than treatment.

Nutritional deficits as a background conditioning a poor outcome in the enteric illnesses of infancy have become rare with a better understanding of food requirements and the availability of clean milk. Qualitative defects that may have bearing in such states as rheumatic fever and allergic conditions remain subjects for study. Accidents have become the chief cause of mortality.

But while figures on mortality and morbidity reflect the great progress that has been made in the fields of nutrition and infection, one's gratification is quickly qualified with concern over the little progress that has been made in dealing with the problems of emotional stress and their immediate and remote implications for the child

---

\* Dr. Johnston is Head of Pediatrics, The Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit, Michigan.

who is to become the adult. When a psychiatric counselor to the students of a large university can say that ten percent of the freshman class are sufficiently disturbed to seek his help, we have reason to doubt our effectiveness in influencing growth and development in ways that would have anticipated and prevented these difficulties.

The more immediate effects of stress have only been appreciated in the last ten years since the physiological effects have been duplicated by cortisone and ACTH. Highly beneficial as these preparations have been in controlling certain aspects of disease, notably the allergic ones, we recognize that during their use the ability to react defensively against infection disappears. Bacteria in the throat that have not been producing disease suddenly become invasive without defense. And now we think we understand the frequency with which injury, exposure and emotional stress are complicated by bacterial infection.

Increasingly we feel that a number of chronic disease process have their conditioning in the field of chronic stress and strain. Parental attitudes in the first few years of life, over-rigidity and over-concern, are quickly reflected in the child. Later a school system seemingly does an adequate job for sixty-six percent of the population but lacks the flexibility that would individualize the groups at either end of the distribution curve. The thought that some correction of this might follow a decision on a child's readiness for school that would be based on some measure other than his chronological age has led to the study currently being conducted at this school. If we could detect the child whose ultimate capability was adequate but whose time schedule of development was slower than the average, we might spare him years of stress in attempting to keep pace with chronological peers when his capacity was always a year behind theirs because innately he was a "late maturer."

In the field of adult cardiovascular disease, the role of stress in producing coronary disease is well accepted but attempts to change attitudes in the adult always brings with them the feeling that we have come too late and that the things we would like to do should have been done in the formative years.

PAUL T. RANKIN\*

I propose first to list the major influences exerted by the school on family effectiveness, including some negative influences; second, to list and explain some specific examples of school activities which contribute to family effectiveness; and third, to attempt an evaluation and propose some needed next steps.

\* Dr. Rankin is assistant superintendent, Detroit Public Schools.

I am almost tempted to list as the first influence of the school on the family the additional time and freedom from responsibility given the mother from 8:30 to 3:30 each day, five days a week, ten months a year. The mother with four children of school age is well aware of the difference in her day when the children are in school and when they are not in school. Some people may consider this to be the schools major contribution to the family today.

### *Influences of School on Family Life*

In my judgment, the prime influence of the school on family life is the assistance it gives to the child in developing fully his potentialities. The goal of parents is to see their children become happy, self-reliant, well-adjusted, and mature adults. This process takes time. As children arrive at successive stages in their physical and mental development they become ready for new educational experiences. Here the school plays an important function in supplementing the home. Let me illustrate: When children reach a mental age of about six and one-half years they are mature enough to learn, "ready," to read. The school provides the experiences and the guidance needed. When children reach middle or late adolescence they begin to think seriously about marriage and their own homes. They are ready for instruction designed to equip them to become effective husbands and wives and later parents. Earlier they were not ready to consider family life from the point of view of husband or wife or father or mother. Later will be too late. I say, then, that the prime influence of the school is the enrichment of family life that occurs when children are helped to achieve their full potentialities.

The school also constitutes a major influence in the unification of the family and indeed our entire society by giving children certain common experiences. The time-honored phrase for this is "the transmission of the social heritage." It is the "common school" through which all children come to know the significance of great days like Independence Day, Labor Day, Bill of Rights Day, Memorial Day. Here they learn of Washington, Lincoln, Clara Barton, Edison, George Washington Carver. Likewise, the school gives all young people at least the rudiments of history, some contact with great literature and music and art, some knowledge of the moral code.

The school operates as a balancing influence on the educational development of children and youth. The complex life of our time calls for teaching of an ever-increasing body of knowledges and skills. Proper balance is not easy to maintain. The family desires well-rounded development on the part of its children, but the goals are rarely as sharply defined and expressed as in the school. There have been many formulations of the goals and objectives of schools; each

endeavors to encompass comprehensively the purposes for which the school exists. One classification which has had much influence on American schools is the statement of the purposes of American education as expressed by the Educational Policies Commission under four headings: (1) self-realization, under which are included the skills and knowledges and interests children need to develop in order to achieve full self-realization; (2) human relationships, under which are put such objectives as respect for every human being, cooperation, the amenities of social behavior, appreciation of the home, and the like; (3) economic efficiency, including the training for a job whereby to earn one's living and the training in consumer economics to use one's money well; and (4) civic responsibility, including the qualities required by the truly educated citizen.

The school influences the quality of family living by providing for children what is generally a happy experience. School and teachers have changed much during the past fifty years. No longer is it thought necessary that learning be an unpleasant experience to be effective. Children today generally like school and like their teachers. The whole school atmosphere is usually friendly and warm; teachers today are increasingly sensitive to the special needs of individual children — needs to feel they belong, to feel the thrill of success, to feel that somebody cares for them — and these teachers act to help individual children meet their particular needs.

Another major positive influence of the school on family life is the emphasis on family life education for both boys and girls. This is new. Highland Park has had it for 15 or 20 years. Detroit has been getting it for eight years. Other schools in the area have classes directed specifically at helping children and youth be better members of their families.

A hundred years ago, Herbert Spencer listed education for family life as one of the four answers he gave to the question, "What knowledge is of most worth?" At the founding of the parent-teacher movement in 1897, family life education was one of the four goals set up. But it has taken a long time for schools generally to offer family life education, to accept some responsibility for helping children understand human development and family life. The 1941 yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators was titled **EDUCATION FOR FAMILY LIFE**. Other educational associations have given increased attention to this area. Schools generally are doing more and more in this field. In Detroit, nearly one-half of our current high-school graduates have taken a course in family living which is offered as an elective in the eleventh or twelfth grade. Our junior high schools and many of our elementary schools also have classes in family life education at the seventh or eighth grade level. In my opinion, the



introduction of family life education, with its emphasis on good human relations and mental health, is the most important single curriculum change that has taken place in the schools of this state in the past quarter-century.

Unfortunately, the school's influence on family life is not always positive. Whenever the teachings of the school are in conflict with the teachings or the desires of the parents, there is potential friction and the danger that the child may be torn between what he learns in school and what he learns at home. Some of these conflicts arise over what seem, to me at least, to be relatively unimportant items, but which seem very important to some parents. For example, a parent may feel that the teacher is teaching subtraction incorrectly because he is teaching subtraction in a way different from that learned by the parent. Or the school may require that elementary-school boys sit in the classroom without coat or sweater, while a parent may feel that his child should wear his coat or sweater.

However, some instances of conflict seem potentially more dangerous to full harmony and cooperation between the school and the home. Consider the child who is taught in school about disease and the prevention of disease by vaccines, while he is being taught otherwise in the home by parents who do not accept the usual concept of disease. What about the situation where the school teaches the theory of evolution, or other concepts that are apparently contrary to the literal interpretation of the Bible, to children in homes where the Bible is read literally? Is there danger when permissiveness is greater in the school than in the home? What happens when the school teaches certain concepts in human relations, perhaps especially in race relations, when parents have radically different views? What about those teachings in the school that may lead children to have less respect for their own families and their own family traditions and ways? For example, the school may teach the importance of having the family eat together and to engage in pleasant conversation at meals. Such teaching may conflict with the practices and traditions in some families where the members rarely or never eat together; or if they do, the children are not allowed to talk at the table.

Certainly there are instances — I hope relatively few — where the school operates to increase the problems in the family and to diminish the satisfactions there. We try, however, in the schools to be sensitive to such dangers and avoid them as far as possible.

### *Specific Contributions of the School*

One element of increasing importance is the growth of the parent-teacher association and similar organizations that bring parents and teachers together in the interest of children. Through PTA meet-



ings using speakers, films, plays or other aids, parents become better acquainted with the course of human development and with the broad social problems that affect the individual home. Furthermore, the very existence of the PTA facilitates getting together individual parents and teachers. When Marilyn's parents and Marilyn's teacher understand each other better, they can work more effectively for Marilyn's good.

The school influences effective family life at all grade levels and in many kinds of school situations. The school may uncover physical or mental or emotional handicaps, for example, the need for glasses. The school develops skill on the part of children in relating to other children and to adults. The school may help children improve their speech habits, and these improved speech habits may carry over into the home. The school helps children develop skills that are useful in the home, in homemaking classes, in art classes, and in household mechanics classes. The boy who has learned to fix a leaky faucet is a real asset in his home; he feels more important to the family when he can make a distinctive contribution. The schools assists the home in teaching respect for authority. The school helps the children develop good taste and discrimination in their own personal reading, in the music they enjoy, in the television and radio programs they choose. Through its homemaking classes, and even more through its cafeterias, the school widens the knowledge that children acquire of different foods and different food habits. The school endeavors to teach respect for the rights of others. The school helps children move from a stage of great dependence on others at the kindergarten level to a high degree of independence and self-direction at the twelfth-grade level. The school helps children to become more self-sufficient in entertaining themselves at home because of their reading skill and their interest in constructive activities, etc. Every one of these phases of growth of the individual child has a bearing on the quality of living in his home.

Some specifics are related to particular age levels. The kindergarten teaches little children how to get along with other children, including the need to share toys or to wait one's turn. The elementary school develops in children the basic skills in the communication arts of speaking and listening, reading and writing. It opens up the areas of history, geography, science, literature, homemaking, and shop. It is the stage at which particular attention is given to safety attitudes and habits. The high schools expand the knowledge children have accumulated in the areas opened up in the elementary school and add new fields, such as foreign language, the commercial subjects, mathematics, civics, and economics. Junior and senior high schools provide opportunities for young people to develop payroll skills which enable them to earn a living.

The adult education program may not be well known. In the public evening schools of Detroit last year, 35,340 different adults took courses to improve their earning ability or to develop interests and activities that enrich their lives. Certainly family life is better when all members of the family continue to grow and develop. A special contribution of the adult education program to family living is the many classes in child care, family life education, and home skills like cooking, sewing, and interior decorating. Actually about five thousand adults are currently in such classes.

### *Next Steps*

I have tried to present the results of my effort to analyze the nature of the influence exerted by the school on family life today. The school does operate as a powerful force influencing the effectiveness of family life—as well it should, in view of the central place that good family life has in any listing of the goals we seek for our world. Much remains to be done, however, to make the schools stronger influences for the improvement of family life. This improvement should take place especially in the specific courses on family life education. Arithmetic and reading and writing and spelling have been taught for hundreds of years in our schools; good teaching procedures for these fields have been stabilized. Teaching the elements of good family living has been attempted in Detroit schools only a few years, and nowhere for more than about twenty-five years. We have much to learn about family life education in public schools: its organization, materials, and methods.

We need also to increase the competence of teachers generally in getting the optimum values for family life out of all the experiences that children have in school, whether in literature, household mechanics, history or science. I hope that there will be an increase in the number of teachers who are sensitive to the needs of individual youngsters and who give those youngsters the extra attention they may need desperately at certain times. For the child who never seems to meet with success, the teacher needs to find something—anything—at which he can excel. For the child who feels unwanted and unloved, the teacher may need to give assurance that he cares.

Besides the improvement in the effectiveness of the school program, the thing that most needs to be done is the development of better communication between the school and the home. Communication is better than it was 50, 25 or even 10 years ago—but it is not good enough. We need an organization of parents and teachers in every school, not just in most schools. We need a better solution to the problem of the exchange of information about individual children between the teacher and the parent. The report card can be made more mean-

ingful and more useful. More schools can make it possible for the parent to have a conference with his child's teacher.

We need more and better materials to interpret the school program to the home. The schools' annual reports tell the story much better than formerly. Some schools, like those in Dearborn and Grosse Pointe, have periodic letters to parents. Detroit and other school systems have guides for parents about the kindergarten experience of their children. However, since the school has the children a larger part of each day than any other agency outside the home, it seems imperative that we utilize every possible means of communication so that teacher and parent may understand each other fully and cooperate in the highest degree.

Today I have tried to present several major ways in which the school influences family life. Most of these ways seem to me good. I have also tried to list for you many of the specific influences. On the basis of some evaluation, the next steps that to me seem important have been listed.

There is no more important function of the public school than the promotion of good family life.

## THE INTEGRITY OF OPTIMUM GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

WILTON MARION KROGMAN\*

My field is that of the physical growth and development of children. At first glance it might seem rather far afield for someone to speak in a symposium devoted to the family when he has little to contribute beyond the interpretation of the biological aspects of the growth and development of the child. Yet I think I shall be able to present material that will certainly link problems of the unfolding biological organism to social reaction within the family unit. To lay before you the rationale, the philosophy, the motivation, that underlies attempts to understand the growth and development of children I would say these few words: "A well-born and a well-reared child is a community asset — anything less is a liability." It is in part of that definition that my interests focus. To begin, I would fix attention upon "well-born" and tell you that we are investigating problems relating to pre-natal growth and development of well-born children, not only in terms of the processes of an unfolding sequence, but also in terms of understanding the circumstances under which a child is brought into the world. The latter represent the effects of a unique combination of heritable streams of biologic background, so that we may say that one of our concerns, and I think one of our obligations to understand, are those circumstances under which a child may come into the world as free as is possible of congenital defect and heritable taint. I realize the implication of the foregoing statement. I realize that we must foray into the fields of human heredity and of human eugenics, but I see no reason why it should not be the birth-right of every youngster to have at least a good running start in this relay of life.

At The Institute for Child Study in Philadelphia we are working on the biological growth problems of the child. We are studying the transmissibility in family-line of some of the defects that can be tackled more easily because they can be objectified and studied. One of every 800 viable infants is born with a defect known as cleft palate and/or cleft lip. With such infants we are attempting to understand some of the principles of inheritance and of consanguinity which

---

\* Dr. Krogman is Director, Institute for Child Study, University of Pennsylvania and Children's Hospital of Philadelphia.

relate to the transmissability (if it be transmissible) of such a defect. We are studying some of the blood dyscrasias to understand as fully and completely as we may, the rules of human transmissability. I would say that a *well-born* child must be one of our objectives. In the next breath I would say of course that achievement of this objective will not occur in my time, or in the times of the young men that I am training, and perhaps not in the time of the youngsters they train. These things do take time, but we are working and we are learning some of the rules of transmissability. They will be applicable to our generation only in terms of remedial therapy but they may be applicable preventively in greater degree with each succeeding generation.

Now, in terms of "well-reared" I'd join hands perhaps more fully with my colleagues who are interested in the entire process of raising a child within the context of the family and the community — the sum total of those factors which must have impact upon the youngster to develop a well-rounded bio-social organism. How do the biologists come into this picture? I would say that the biologist comes into the picture because the child as a biological entity is not growing up in a cultural vacuum, or indeed, looking from the other side of the coin, we may say that the socialization process is not independent of any of the biological sequences that are characteristic of organic behavior. So, after studying the physical growth and development of the child, we may, for that moment in time, give an appraisal of the growth *status* of that youngster. We may say, in effect, that up to now a child has grown satisfactorily, that he has no obvious growth deviations, and that he displays no radical departure from any norm which would indicate that he represents a failure in the process of growth. But status is only part of the picture. More important, I would say, we are the ones who preside over the interpretation of growth *progress* in the youngster. We have data available which enable us to measure the unfolding process, the dynamics of going from one growth stage to another. Technically, we may tell you of the increments of growth.

We have the guarantee that as we watch these youngsters the growth factors necessary to go from one progressive step to another are acceptably normal for that youngster. We are watching progressive, satisfactory growth over a period of time. Thus, we develop the concept whereby we may assure that youngster and the parents of that youngster, that within reason the child may be *compared* satisfactorily to norms that have been derived for age and sex peers. Comparability is very important in the sense that the child feels that at any time or in any phase of his growth he has held his own with the growth rate represented by his age peers.

I would go a bit further and say that we are working with growth of children within what we call *family-lines*, that is, we recognize the

growth pattern of the individual child. The bio-genetic pattern of that youngster represents a combination of the genetic impulses transmitted in the maternal and paternal family-lines. Therefore, when I work with a child I do not from existing standards arbitrarily say this child is above or below this or that, he is too tall, he is too short, underweight or overweight. An interpretation is made only after that child's bio-genetic potential is equated with those that are presumably characteristic of all children. Studying the growth of children in family-lines and gathering such data is one of the best methods that we may utilize in better understanding the processes of human heredity, the transmissibility of such things as height and weight, body-build ratios and many others. As an example, since I measure children in great detail, the transmissibility of facio-dental characteristics might be of import in answering, "why does my youngster have crooked teeth and some other youngster not?" The family-line approach is two-fold: it is a measure of bio-social assurance that the child is fitting into an accepted pattern of growth and it is a magnificent tool, whereby we may gain better understanding of transmissibility in genetic terms.

Finally, I may take all I have said and funnel it into the ultimate objective of all of our work: the guarantee to a youngster that everything we have learned about him is vouchsafed to him, *to the integrity of himself*, to the dignity of his ego-concept of self, to his acceptability within the frame-work of the growth norms that are applicable to our population at large. My subject, "the integrity of optimum growth", might well have been stated as the integrity of the individual child within the family unit, so that judgments between siblings be not the harshness of the rude and unwarranted application of mean values, standards, norms, or average, disregarding the fact that each child represents a unique combination of the bio-genetic impulses resident within the total family-line.

For example, I have a fraternal twin brother, and when we were in the second grade it was decided that height and weight tables might well be applied to all the youngsters. The fitted my brother well, they did not fit me. So, once each week, I had to go through a door above which there was a wholly unwarranted statement, a violation of the integrity of the individual, *Room for Remedial Feeding*. I was forced to eat material which was presumed would restore to me a desirable height-weight ratio. The recognition was not then forthcoming that my brother was my mother's family-line and I was my father's family-line. To paraphrase Kipling, "ne'er the twins did meet."

To close in a more serious note, the following lines from Thoreau commend themselves to me, and I think they're applicable. "If a man

does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or however far away." I ask this for our children: let them step to the drummer of their own growth tempo and rhythm. The music is theirs, their ears hear it, not ours; but the music will end on the splendid note of the ultimate achievement of each individual adult status.



## STRENGTH WHICH CAN BE DEVELOPED FROM WITHIN

MARIE I. RASEY\*

Alice Trent is a young, inexperienced teacher in Detroit, very enthusiastic about her work as an art teacher. Recently, art teachers were very busy with Thanksgiving activities. Alice was so zealous and so enthusiastic that by Tuesday night she had used all materials allotted to her for that week and had lost nearly all of her enthusiasm. Wednesday came and when the third grade came to the art room she gave them drawing paper and materials and then said in the very best Emily Post of the current education millennium, "Would you children like to make me a lovely picture of Plymouth Rock?" Almost every child, either because he was a fatalist or a bit of a cynic perhaps, went right to work. One youngster, however, recently come up from a rural section of the South, didn't get to work. So the teacher said to him, again in the most approved fashion, "Don't you want to make a picture of Plymouth Rock?"

"Oh, yes, Ma'am I do, but I don't rightly know whether you-all waiting for me to make you a rooster or a hen".

This can probably be called a story and since it has amused a few of you I suppose it could be called a funny story. It was not, however, my reason for presenting it to you. My purpose was to demonstrate the dilemma you and I are in because we're talking with such words as "strength" and "with-ins" and quite surely the experience and the uniqueness of each of us will give us a different significance for these terms. The youngster had had much experience of poultry and he did what he could with his concept of Plymouth Rock; he showed what he had with which to fill the term. But Alice was a city girl who had had no experience of poultry; so she could only hear the child's words as nonsense. She did not understand the words, so she made a judgment of the child; he's trying to be smart.

We have here neither the time nor the facilities to tease from the consciousness of each of us what we mean by "strength" and "within". It would be fun to find out, if we could. We don't have the time, so perhaps the next best thing is for me to tell you what these things have meant to me, not with any sense of their being right answers but for purely utilitarian purposes in relation to our thinking. I'm inclined

---

\* Dr. Rasey is Professor of Educational Psychology, Wayne University.

to believe that the word strength on our program means what I am more likely to call values, — a sort of label for the abstraction of all the attitudes and skills and atoms of knowledge that our yesterdays have brought together in the interests of our tomorrows. These seem to condition what each of us sees as he looks out on his externality. They may even determine what is seeable for the individual person, and certainly they afford a child a personal kind of value, which lets, or is required for, the child to release the energy he is towards the purposes which seem worthwhile to him.

"With-in" troubles me greatly because each time I look it seems there isn't anything but with-in. This is a troublesome word. As happens so often with information provided for us by experts, the laboratory outruns the vocabulary we have for its results. We still use very frequently a curious old verb which denies the unity of personality in which I think we all believe. If we say, as I think we must, that a child does not so much *have* a body as he *is* one, then he doesn't so much *have* a mind as he *is* one, and if there should prove to be such thing as spirit (I suspect there is) he *is* also that. He doesn't *have* it, and in this many-faceted, single unity which the child is, he manifests all of these strengths and he can make use of them. There are all of these values with which he releases his energy toward his purposes.

Rather than speak too much of underlying theory and principle I would like to tell briefly the story of a child I observed. She had come into the world very poorly equipped because of nutrition problems in Europe during the war. The evidences of malnutrition were easily visible, x-rays showed them even more surely. The parents were not able to do much for this child. They were troubled and disturbed. They had lost a child by starvation. It was necessary for the child to join another family.

When I saw this child first I was told she couldn't feed or dress herself, go downstairs alone, or have a door closed. She couldn't go to sleep without someone lying beside her. Had it been possible for this five-year-old to verbalize the state in which he found herself, or the image of herself which she held, I think she would have had to say, "I'm just a little girl". I think she would have put "just" in. She would have been saying: "I'm just a little girl who can't accomplish anything without the help of my adults. I can't let myself go into that mysterious thing sleep unless someone is near by; I can't feed myself; I can't dress myself". Quite obviously the image was made up of "can't". It seems to be necessary for we human beings to feel that we have at least a fighting chance of success before we are able to spend ourselves.

The family assuming responsibility for this child hardly knew where to begin. Closed doors with a child of this kind of inheritance? None of

us could know what that might symbolize. The child had one very bad eye and we couldn't be too sure the glasses corrected her vision; they might be making a look down the stairs appear more perilous than it was. Where the image was to be corrected, where the "cans" were to begin which would replace the "can't-neses" was the problem. Finally, the family undertook to approach this in terms of food, for it seemed that hunger would be on her side, and perhaps on the side of the family. At her first meal she drank orange juice and nothing else; for the second meal she drank milk and nothing else. At her third meal, however, she took up her spoon and wielded it manfully. The meal was served in extremely small portions so she asked for a second. From then till now this child has been what anybody would call a good eater and the good eating has begun to show.

When it was necessary to do something about sleeping the frightened child cried, but no adult did lie down with her because there's no degree of lying down or not lying down, but the adult stayed in the lighted room. When the child began hysterically, "Oh, please don't close the door, but did not have enough English words to say close or don't close," she was invited to get out of bed and fix the door as she wanted it. The whole story would be too long but she graduated from one kind of small help to another, all the while aware of improvement in her image of herself. We tried to get her into water but she could only risk a little toe.

The assistant thought that she would like to try an experiment and bought for the child a bright, cunning little bathing suit. But she had reckoned, as adults so often do, without the child. The child knew a lot about new clothes and one of things she knew for sure was that you never got them wet. If the assistant had wished to keep the child out of the water, she could not have done it more successfully with strands of wire.

I kept close track of the progress of this child; her file was full of notes. Winter came on, the lake froze and big children were skating and little ones were sliding on boot soles. I never dreamed that this child would risk going on ice because I was troubled with the knowledge that the ice was the same water she had been afraid of earlier. She was untroubled by this. She took her turn to run and slide. Standing up she turned to me and called, "Oh, Miss Rasey, I got so many things I Can". Whether verbalization has a special significance I don't know, but her progress was very much more rapid from that time on. I haven't seen her for a couple of years but from reports she is doing very nicely with this positive kind of image.

We can well ask, are we saying that for an individual person to have strengths within a person need only to have a series of successes and perhaps finally verbalize those successes? I think there are two

answers, a yes and a no. Yes, this is all that was necessary if one generalizes it largely enough, if one sees that in this knowing the child releases its own strengths in the process of becoming evermore perfectly what it already is. I'm not sure that is in anybody's dictionary as a definition of education and growth but it seems to me that's what it means. It must also be an emphatic no, if we think of the specifics. A child needs other kinds of experience. I saw a child not too long ago who spoke with great interest and great accuracy about the heavenly bodies. I said, "Where did you find out so much about the stars?" The seven-year-old said very nonchalantly, "Oh, I'm a great wonderer and my daddy is a great wonderer too and so we wonder together and then we hunt the answers."

Another five-year-old, very determined to find out, sat down beside me one day and said: "I just found out that all the work horses in the world are boy horses and all the riding horses in the world are girl horses". I said: "Isn't that queer, when I was a little girl the horses I knew were just the opposite." With a long-drawn sigh which any of us who has hunted our own answers has often experienced, he said, "Well, probably, I don't know all the horses in the world yet". This seems to me an inner strength which will be very serviceable indeed.

Another child was helping a parent. They were fixing a flower bed, making the soil fine and discussing whether it would be wise the next day to put the yellow pansies or the dark ones at the back. Presently the youngster sat back on his heels and said, "You know, Dad, I just thought about it but a pansy bed that's going to be isn't nearly as pretty as a pansy bed that is." This seems to me evidence of a kind of strength which will enable that particular youngster to stay with his dream until it becomes a reality.

In school, where I've had most of my chance to work with families in which I can see the inter-play of all these inner strengths I am sure that I can see this one thing, certainly as a technique. Parents are always saying: "What can I do to facilitate these growths for my child?" I think we can almost say: "Don't worry so much about the doing. Just worry about the being." As the father who is a wonderer and the father who is a gardener it is the "being" which helps to turn the trick for the strengths. Finally, we have evidence in our school programs — all the recent commotion about the famous three R's. When Jefferson proposed them for members of a democracy, he proposed them for quite different reasons than we now value them. Perhaps as the needs of life change the needs of preparation for that life may change also. Just to vary the monotony of the discussion about the three R's I would enjoy some emphasis on the four L's. Two of them are already automatized pretty well: we live and we learn. Some of us

live longer than we want to and we learn, not always pleasantly and not always quickly, but life gets its work done. But to live and to learn and to laugh and to love — the four require some doing, and I'm inclined to think that the family is the place in which these growths best take place.

I visited a home for delinquent children, in India. It was poorly equipped by all counts that we would have but in the middle of the compound there were cages containing every type of bird and small beast one could think of. A great old scoldy goose that hissed at me, a small fawn, dogs and cats ran free. I think I must have looked surprised to see so many animals and the director of this marvelous institution said: "We have to have a lot of such things because the children that come here need so terribly to have something to love." This surprised me and I said: "Well, I'm more accustomed to hearing that such children need to be loved." He was silent for a few moments and then said: "Yes, I think I understand that too. It's very pleasant to be loved but the real necessity is to love."

## STRENGTH WHICH CAN BE DRAWN FROM WITHOUT

LAWRENCE K. FRANK\*

I have a curious feeling of participating in a trio — three speakers and on the program we have three topics. It's very much as if we're dealing with three sides of, shall I say the family triangle? Dr. Krogman has given us, it seems to me, the broad base of this triangle: the concept of optimum growth and development as a source of the integrity of the individual, and also the family. Dr. Rasey has given us another side of this triangle in the concept of inner-strength and the sources of that strength which the individual and the family, at least initially, possess but may or may not be capable of using for a variety of reasons. Less fortunate circumstances may evoke that strength, bring it out in some measure so that it can be functional. I think we're beginning to recognize this inner-strength as so tremendously important today because it is upon that inner-strength the family must draw when it's confronted with the many and inevitable tasks of family living, the frequent problems, emergencies and crises and above all the maintenance of those aspirations which make the family an on-going, continuing adventure.

We certainly should recognize that we of today are living longer than any generation has lived in the history of the world. Our children, the babies born today, are going to live longer lives than we. It's a biological revolution of unprecedented significance and it has profound implication for families. Those who are studying our population, our life expectancy tables are saying that "the men and women of today can statistically, at least, look forward to 20 to 25 years of life after their youngest child leaves home." Do you realize how important, therefore, it is for the family to have strength from within and from without for that longer life and particularly for those added years for which we have so little precedent and guidance?

I am to discuss the third side of this triangle, encompassing strength from "without." To do that with some relevance to what's gone before I must ask you to recognize that many ways of thinking, familiar to us, those of cause and effect, of stimulus response and linear types of approach are not really applicable or relevant here. When we talk about the family and its strength from within and without, we must

\* Dr. Frank is a member of the Visiting Faculty of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Formerly, Director, Caroline Zachary Institute for Human Development.

recognize that those strengths inside which Dr. Rasey has talked about, this integrity which Dr. Krogman has emphasized, can become operational only as they are reciprocally related to what is outside. With equal emphasis I would say that whatever is outside that is relevant and significant, for what is inside, can become operational only as these outside strengths and resources are evoked by what is inside. Does this sound crazy? Does it sound as if I were saying that what's outside is really inside and what's inside is really outside? Well, that's indeed what I'm trying to say and I would like to illustrate that circular reciprocal process, a process that's been called a transactional process. It isn't interaction, it's transaction. Look at the human body; it derives from its mammalian ancestries and the millions of years of mammalian development a truly marvelous capacity to maintain an inner stability. This is a dynamic equilibrium, not a static one, which despite changing conditions, impacts, exertions, emergencies and crises, nevertheless keeps that inside stable.

Now the human organism, Dr. Krogman points out, starts as an infinitesimal fertilized egg, grows, develops, approaches an optimum, doesn't always reach it, continually changing from moment to moment while exhibiting this capacity for self-regulation and self-repair. It does it only by its capacity to carry on a never ceasing intercourse with the environment—breathing, eating, drinking, heat-exchange, eliminating, sleeping and so on. I'm trying to say that this means that the organism by its own inner self regulated and learned patterns (because we transform those patterns by our education of the child) by its transactions with the outside world it is continually evoking what it needs. We're evoking the air of oxygen, we're evoking food and so on and this evocation, this capture, this use of what is needed is not governed by the mere adequacy or surplus of what's outside but by the individual capacity of the organism to take what it needs. As a simple illustration: you need oxygen, every cell, every tissue in your body needs oxygen. If you are anemic you can breathe in air but you just can't capture and utilize enough oxygen to keep your tissues properly supplied. If there's anything outside that's important to the organism, it's also related reciprocally to what's inside and if there's anything inside that's important in an organism it's also related by transaction to what is outside.

Now during the depression some of you remember we used to speak about starvation in the midst of plenty. We thought of this as an economic paradox, but I suggest to you it's a social, psychological paradox—in a family living today. Probably never before has there been such an array and abundance of sources of strength, assistance, treatment, guidance, education, services and so on for families as now exist in our nation. Granted they are not adequate in terms of good professional standards and we need many more of them. I am em-



phasizing that there are all these resources of strength and help for family living outside but something within families is blocking or preventing their use. There's some resistance, some curious anxiety perhaps, as Dr. Rasey has pointed out, the image the family has of itself stands in its way of making use of what we know. From studies in New York, individuals who desperately needed medical care wouldn't go across the street to a hospital. Somehow they said "I'm not worthy of that" or "This disease is something I must suffer because I'm guilty of so and so." Things of that kind are serious and I'm trying to point out that this something is preventing families from utilizing the sources of strength now available which they may very desperately need, from which they could always benefit and very often could derive much needed reinforcement of strength.

Many social workers who will tell you it's the hardest thing in the world to get some families to go to a clinic or hospital or a guidance person or a psychiatrist. Practically every one of the helping professions will tell you of the enormous difficulty of persuading families either to agree to have some very necessary professional service. You say this only applies to the so-called ignorant and demoralized. No, this applies to all of us. Every family shows this to some extent and it's a very puzzling situation because it is starvation in the midst of plenty. Perhaps families of today are living such lives of quiet desperation that they just haven't got the energy, the spontaneity, what it takes to make the effort to seek these sources of strength and help. In addition, we find many families that cannot establish productive relations. I like the term "productive relations" because it indicates a reciprocal relationship with the communities they live in.

This starvation in the midst of plenty does not apply only to services. One of paradoxes in family life is the starvation in the midst of plenty in the family, men, women, and children starving for love and affection, or an opportunity to be loved or to give love, because somehow they can't communicate. They starve for many things because of their inability to relate themselves to their neighbor, to the school and other parents, to various groups, to the very sources of enrichment and enjoyment of life, the arts, music, museum, libraries, recreation. You might say they use a lot of amusements but much of this is escape, to forget their misery and troubles and inability to use the many kinds of facilities which we as a nation offer in more profusion than any other, where they could develop all kinds of skills and capacities, interests, hobbies, where they could discover themselves.

An inability of another kind seems to me very important — the inability to relate to this amazing on-going drama of human existence. We're living in a time that the historians for the next four or five hundred or one thousand years are going to look back at and say, "That was the most exciting time in the history of mankind. Tremendous

things were happening." Well, we're living in these times but most of us are unaware of it. We're living fossils. We exist but we can't live "at the height of our time," to be a part of this on-going drama because of something inside ourselves, probably our preoccupation with our own little worries. We're not really living or aware of all these sources of strength from outside.

I don't want to unload all of this on the family. There are many serious handicaps but I must point out that marvelous resources are available. I'm not going into detail for you know them. I do want to point out that they're organized and operated as more or less specialized, isolated, unrelated services. The result is that today families are very often being demoralized, torn by conflicts, by the very agencies and institutions and professions that are supposed to be helping them because these various professions cannot, will not and have not been able to come to any kind of agreement in approaching families. Perhaps we must think in terms of how we can persuade the professions to strive for this agreement or if not the professions the professional schools in which this is being perpetuated, often by the kind of teaching which results in the trained incapacity of the specialist, trained to be unable to communicate with other people who are also dealing with human beings.

It's really astonishing to look at most of our universities and see every professional school operating in this splendid isolation and then realize that every graduate in those professions is going out to practice in a community upon the same people and use them, if you please, for a lot of professional purposes and things that may seem very admirable but are devastating to the morale, the integrity of the family. People are being terribly disturbed by it, I think, and they can't benefit from these professional skills because family life is not a series, a congeries of unrelated functions and needs. It's what some of us like to call an organized complexity of many functions, relations and activities, no one of which can be altered without disturbing all the others. Look at what we've been doing in caring for pregnant women in child-birth. For reasons that go back to Pasteur the obstetrician said the most important thing in the world is the maintenance of a germ-free environment. So the husband must never come near the baby and the baby must be put off in a separate unit. We have been separating, splitting up the family in its most crucial, vital periods, separating baby from mother at the most critical period in his life history, at the inception of capacity to love and be loved, and keeping the husband away at the time which is vital for the marriage. With the beginning of what's been called "rooming-in", keeping mothers and babies together, a very slow effort to improve this is being resisted by a great many hospital people and obstetricians and

impeded by the type of construction in hospitals that were built to last 60 years. This is probably another one of the most extraordinary periods in history when we have organized research devoting intense efforts to accelerate obsolescence in all of our structures and technology.

Until recently we have had family agencies and child agencies and never the twain got together. We've had adult clinics and child clinics. Now we're beginning to see some movement to come together. The child guidance clinics are saying that maybe they should have something to do with the parent while they're treating a problem child. The family agencies are saying, "really we've got to get together because the child agencies do one thing and we do another." From one point of view, it's scandalous when we realize what it means for families who are living lives of desperation and need all the help from outside they can but such help often tears them apart. There are signs of change and I don't want you to think I'm wholly pessimistic, but when we talk about the strength from without, let's realize some of the difficulties within the family as well as those outside which prevent these marvelous resources from becoming truly operational.

#### POTENTIAL RESOURCES WHICH FAMILIES CAN USE TO BECOME INCREASINGLY EFFECTIVE

During one-half day of the Symposium, discussions of specific areas of potential resources for families were guided by discussion leaders with the assistance of resource persons, recorders and hosts assigned to each group. These sessions were well attended and produced enthusiastic responses. The group subjects and their leaders were:

**Research**—Dr. Margaret N. Murphy, Head, Department of Family Life, Purdue University.

**Law**—Dr. Mildred T. Tate, Head, Department of Home Economics, Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

**Social Welfare**—Mrs. Ivor Echols, Merrill-Palmer School.

**Religion**—Dr. Russell C. Smart, Head, Department of Child Development and Family Relations, University of Rhode Island.

**Preschool Education**—Dr. Katherine Roberts, Dean, School of Home Economics, The Woman's College of the University of North Carolina.

**Elementary Education**—Dr. Clark Moustakas, Merrill-Palmer School.

**Secondary Education**—Miss Gladys Panton, Merrill-Palmer School.

**Adult Education**—Mrs. Marjorie Cosgrove, Head, Department of Family Life, Highland Park, Michigan, Public Schools.

**Community Planning and Housing**—Dr. Ernest Osborne, Teachers College, Columbia University.

**Mental and Physical Health**—Dr. Robert Foster, Menninger Clinic, Topeka, and Dr. Helen A. Hunscher, Head, Department of Home Economics, Western Reserve University.

## SOURCES OF FUTURE STRENGTHS—PANEL

LAWRENCE K. FRANK

We've now reached the stage now in this Symposium where we Americans always like to get some closure. The difficulty is that since we're concerned with the family and with children, we're very much like the situation in the play, *The Skin of Our Teeth*. The girl says that this play's been going on for many centuries and finally at the end you might as well go home, this play's going on. So, in a certain sense, there can be no closure here.

Anyone who works with families and children professionally or in education must be concerned with the future because that's what we're building for. The whole question of providing services for families cannot be thought of merely in terms of the present but must include the concept of trying to help people go forward as members of a family—husbands, wives and children. So it is quite appropriate at this last session of this Symposium on "Effective Families, Today and Tomorrow" that we try to look forward.

This isn't a crystal ball procedure in which we're going to cook up fantasies of the future—a lot of people are doing that—rather, this panel composed of individuals who've been looking at the situation and asking themselves these questions for years—are asking what lies today for effective family living? All conferences suffer from lack of time and there is going to be a lot of unfinished business today. This does not bother me; we're going to have more conferences of this kind.

We never do quite wrap things up, get said all the things to be said—we can never communicate all of the things that were developed in small groups. For example, this morning we had ten or twelve small discussion groups covering a wide variety of topics on the potential resources which families can use to become increasingly effective. We had a discussion at lunch today. We hoped we could pass some of this material on but we have not been able to do so, sheerly for lack of time. There is an enormous amount of really productive, imaginative thinking going on among the members of this group and perhaps this session will serve somewhat to bring into focus and to indicate the directions in which further thinking and development can occur.

I'm going to ask the four panel members to whom you've just been introduced each to make a brief initial statement. This is calling for great self-restraint because they have so much to offer. Then, they

can elaborate in answers to questions or in terms of internal needs or in making clear anything they didn't have time for earlier. Thus, we can try in the time at our disposal to roughly delineate what lies ahead for effective family living, leaving a lot of loose corners and a lot of unexplored areas. Some of your questions may be left unanswered because of lack of time or could not be answered because we just don't know enough. I'm optimistic enough to feel that as long as you leave this afternoon feeling that there is a future for the family, we are beginning to recognize more clearly what is needed for effective family life. We will recognize that there is something in people themselves, some strong, ever-renewed aspiration which generation after generation finds expression in marriage, family life and raising children. As long as we've got that dynamic vision, we can't be really pessimistic about the future.

MURIEL BROWN\*

This morning, in trying to orient myself to the theme of our panel, I asked myself three questions. I'm not sure how much they will help the discussion but I would like to relate my remarks to them now. My chief discovery, as I tried to do this, was the fact that I myself am now a displaced person. After several years in international education I find that it's awfully hard to look at the question of family living in the United States without thinking of it, in connection with some of the family problems in the rest of the world.

The first question I asked myself was — what kind of predictions can we make now, who knows exactly about anything? Our American need to project in the future is rather peculiarly our own, I've discovered. I'll never forget a painful session with a man in the Ministry of Education in one of the Arab countries who finally said, apropos of a committee which had been stalling for what seemed an interminable length of time, "But, my dear friends, *don't* you understand that we don't *like* to plan?" By that time we were very willing to admit that probably they didn't. What we see ahead for families in this country or in other countries we can imagine only in terms of what we think is going on now, and in terms of the aspirations we have for something better. Because this is so, we must be extra careful not to try to force other people to help make our dreams come true unless these dreams can be their dreams as well. If we have something special to contribute to education for family living here and elsewhere I think it is the belief that the democratic process has its roots in the family in a democratic society. In what direction is family development in the United States going now? It has been useful to me to

\* Dr. Brown is consultant in Community Education, Division of International Education, Washington, D.C.

think of it as going in the direction of (now thinking of the family) a very small free society in which group life evolves, to the extent that there is group life — in accordance with values held by the majority of the group, hopefully by everyone in it and, second, in accordance with the extent to which those holding these values in the family can utilize resources to realize them. Precious as these concepts are to us, however, it is essential to remember that family development in other cultures may be taking place in accordance with quite different values.

What are some of the assets in the American scene for continuing positive development of United States family life? First and most important, perhaps, is our commitment to the pragmatic approach. When we plan something new we always want to know what we have, what it means and what we can do to make it better. That's true whether we're talking about experiences within the family, within the neighborhood and/or within the community, at local, national, and international levels. A second asset, to me, is our faith in the evolutionary process. Sometimes we don't realize how unique that concept is, even to cultures holding values similar to ours. Our faith in education as a means of influencing the direction of evolutionary processes is another asset and our increasing willingness and ability to face our problems and try to do something about them is a fourth. Our unprecedented opportunities to enrich our thinking and deepen our insight by finding out how the rest of the world thinks and feels about the basic, common experiences of life constitute a fifth asset. By the way, I wish time permitted us to discuss the significance of the phenomenal growth of basic education for better living around the world today.

What are some of the emergent problems we must face if family living in the years ahead is to fulfill the potentialities we believe that it has? I think, we must first recognize the essential interdependence of families all over the world. It is as if the walls had suddenly gone down in communities where properties once were pretty well protected from each other by very high fences. Now it's true that six of every ten babies born in this country do not die before they reach school age but six of ten babies do die in Egypt before they reach school age, and that is probably a fair statement about infant mortality in Iraq and other countries. Discussing this problem with a group of social workers and teachers in Berlin one day I suddenly looked up and saw the horror on the face of a woman who exclaimed: "These things are so *near* to us! Why, it's *important* to us in Berlin that such things happen in Cairo and in the valley of the Nile." It's important to us in New York and Detroit, too. We must also face the need for recognizing and accepting variations in patterns of family living. If family interaction produces positive values in personality develop-



ment then it's good, even if it's different, and some of the differences are fascinating to behold. Then, we need to recognize opportunities for developing "the strength within" by meeting and dealing with the forces impinging from without. In this connection I have in mind the responsibility of everyone to help make family welfare a national policy. Almost the only time in my experience that that's really been a fact was during the floods in Holland three years ago. At the height of the disaster the Minister of Health said to a well-known Dutch psychiatrist: "Look, we've got these hundreds and hundreds and thousands of families to take care of, what does Mental Health have to say to us now with the winds raging outside and the water rising and the dykes breaking?" The psychiatrist responded: "Two things I want to say to you as impressively as I can — don't separate children from their families and send families into the most familiar kinds of evacuation centers — don't send farmers to the cities and city people to the country. Keep children with their families and quarter them even temporarily in places that are as much like their homes as possible."

The other points I wanted to make are the need for recognizing opportunities for developing the strength within by looking honestly at what's happening without and the need for recognizing that each family must be concerned about all families and about all children. Anyone who has visited the International Children's Village in Switzerland comes away with a feeling that one must do one's utmost to spread this understanding. Then, there is the need to be vigilant in meeting and trying to overcome threats to family dignity and happiness, wherever they exist. Around the world today one of the greatest threats to the integrity of family life are the racial antagonisms which girdle the globe. They may differ in each country but they are, I think, one of the biggest problems of our age. There is the need for a closer integration between home education and school education so that children are not torn by enforced loyalty to two incompatible sets of values. Also, there's a need for a better interrelation between family and community life.

There is the problem of making continuing efforts to fathom the nature and the meaning of love, which seems to have been rediscovered in our time. I'm not at all sure we'd go all the way with Dr. Montague on his fifteen characteristics but there is a need for vastly improving our programs of family life education. After twenty years in this field I'm convinced that we yet know very little about what, where, and when to teach. Social security, for example, is not understood by a minute fraction of the millions of families who have to use it. There is a great need for integrating resources without and helping people to use them to meet the needs within. The awful unrelatedness of our resources and needs in the field of community



organization and planning is still a major problem in the United States. Finally, it seems to me, the need is imperative to realize that we *know* very little about how to communicate with each other in terms of meaning. Let's try harder to *do something* about that!

MARTHA MACDONALD\*

I should preface the comments I make as a psychiatrist with the reminder that my opinions are based upon observations of a segment of the population and that this segment to a large extent is composed of people who are frequently depressed and anxious and those who often find little contentment or comfort in everyday living. Last night a speaker mentioned the need of living, learning, laughing, and loving. Frequently the people who come to see the psychiatrist have difficulties in all of these areas. They have difficulty in accepting themselves and in accepting others and often say, "I don't like myself and I don't like anyone else." At one pole we see those lonely isolates who long for acceptance, who long for communication with others but are unable to communicate — they are blocked in their efforts of coming together with others. At the other pole are those who do belong to groups and are conflicted by it — wishing in part to be free, free of the emotional ties, free of responsibilities. The roots of patterns of behavior such as this come from the family, they are formed in the family.

I would like to comment, very briefly, on the hypothetical healthy family, healthy emotionally. I would say that this is a family in which there is a minimum of mistaken identity, mistaken identity in terms of time, place, and person. What is the degree to which adults in the family see relationships as they really are, here and now, without the need of distorting them to fit them into the past experience that was suitable and fitting when they were infants or young children? For example, the woman who when she marries wishes or expects that the husband behave as if he were someone else — father, brother, or possibly even her mother; the husband who expects or wishes a wife to behave as a mother, sister, school teacher or grandmother. This is displacement into past history — the husband who behaves as if the wife were an alien part of himself and vice versa; the parent who behaves as if the child was not the child of here and now but a brother or sister of yesterday; or the parent who behaves as if the child is a re-creation of his own unfulfilled childhood. This is the continuous problem of time and change and how we accept it. Only disappointment and unhappiness can result from such unrealistic degrees of mistaken identity. The need, then, of a child is to grow into an awareness of his own personal identity, an idea of self, to develop his ego strength

\* Dr. MacDonald is a psychiatrist and is located in Sarasota, Florida.

and then the ability to grant such individual identity to others. Some years ago a catchy little Scotch song, "I Know Where I Am Going and I Know Who Is Going With Me," expressed this quite nicely. Modern psychiatry is concerned, then, with Man's understanding of himself and of the forces which shape his human experiences, be these biological, psychological, or sociological.

Thinking in general about the family and what the future holds for it, I am optimistic as I look back over the years and view the present. From an economic standpoint we could look upon the family really as a growth stock or investment, one wherein we must invest much. The dividends may be small at the moment because they are being plowed back into the company but the growth is something that is on a very marked uphill trend. From the viewpoint of health look at what has been achieved in cutting infant mortality rates, the increased life span, the role of antibiotics, what has happened in immunization to polio within the last few months, the work that is going on in maternal and child health care in the prenatal field. I saw the first plans for rooming-in used during the war in Washington. I saw how few people were willing to accept it and how movements like this do grow; the inclusion of the father in this unit of caring for the child; preschool education and day-care service; the amount of in-service training that is going into work with public health people; the amount of anticipatory guidance given to parents all along the way; the attitude that school health is concerned not only with communicable disease and correction of defects; and that mental health is not just a remedial program but is a positive program in terms of positive values.

Looking at the family physician, we see a better trained man, with better facilities to work with. Today medical schools recognize the need for medical students to know something about families. There are schools wherein the freshman medical student is assigned a family and follows "his" family throughout his student days. I know of hospitals being built in connection with medical schools with plans for a mother to bring older children or her husband with her when she comes to deliver a child and for the family to stay in a unit that is more like an apartment.

We can think of many changes already in progress which will influence effective family life in the years ahead: the quality of supervision and assistance a student has in college, the hospital and health insurance that is available for workers and their dependents, the amount of elective medical care that can be given now in contrast to what was available in the past and the services to veterans; in industry — the periodical medical checkups, retirement and social security; the whole huge field of geriatrics — nutrition for the older person, leisure time activities by which it's acceptable for Grandma Moses to

paint and have the paintings enjoyed not only by herself but also by others; in the field of welfare—the improved standard of living, economic security, home ownership, F.H.A. and G.I. loans, unemployment insurance, pension plans, aid to dependent children, mechanical aids in homemaking (the wife-saver house which didn't exist before) and recreation—even TV contributes to family living in group experience and sharing; in public education—TV, magazines, the press.

With all of the new drugs, the physician often finds that he is asked, "What about this new drug which I saw written up in *Readers' Digest*; or in *Time*?" A vast amount of informal education is available at the point of need from the prenatal period to senescence. The broader concepts with the importance of the family is being stressed in all areas of professional education—doctors, lawyers, teachers, ministers, nurses, social workers, and community leaders. There have been vast strides as in engineering but in human engineering we have not kept pace. Our vast amount of knowledge has been mentioned here before and the need for effectively translating knowledge into action has been emphasized. To do this we need to develop techniques to make the family, the nest in which the young grow, as healthy a family unit as possible. In closing, I trust that no community will look toward a mental hygiene clinic as a substitute for defects in the basic services that need to be supplied in all areas in health, welfare, and education.

ERNEST OSBORNE\*

Years ago, when I was a cub in the family life education field, I sat in a meeting and heard Larry Frank throw out one of those arresting and electrifying remarks that fall so easily from his lips. He said, in effect, that nothing could be more revolutionary in our society than if all of us who have any kind of contacts with families put the family and its members first in our consideration. The revolution hasn't come but there are some good evidences that we are at least in a pre-pre-revolutionary period. A significant number of things indicate that we are on the threshold, if we haven't already entered, a period when the family is becoming more central, when we do have much more of a family-centered emphasis than perhaps some of us, who, by temperament, find it easy to look on the dark side of things, realize.

The development of atomic energy, of automation, of express transportation, these and other scientific and technical advances mean that the arena of human activity is changing very rapidly from being business-work centered to being living centered. All we need to do is look at the hours of work that our grandfathers had to put in and the

\* Dr. Osborne is Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

hours of work the average person puts in today to see one aspect of this change. There just isn't any question but that men and women and children are having available much more time for family living and that increasing numbers are finding more of their major life interest in family living than has perhaps been true for many a generation. This offers the tremendous challenge to us, as family members and as representatives of the various person-serving professions to participate in what seems to be an ongoing, unstopable kind of development. We're making some of the adaptations almost without realizing it. In my introduction it was mentioned that I had been associated with Girl Scouts, the Y.M.C.A. and other such organizations. The reason I have given a good deal of time and interest to these organizations is because of the fact that they are in the van in the family life field. I doubt that many people in this audience realize how far, for instance, an organization like the Y.M.C.A. has and is going in a family-centered program and activity.

I met as a consultant about six weeks ago with the National Program Committee made up of outstanding laymen and top level personnel in the Y.M.C.A. Three-fourths of the total three-day discussion was devoted to whether the Y.M.C.A. should move in the direction of more family emphasis, how it should be done and what were the implications of what already had been done. There are nearly 300,000 women and girl members of the organization working and playing largely in family units. In lesser degree this is true of other youth-serving agencies like the Girl Scouts.

I think psychiatrists and the mental health workers have brought to us the realization that one cannot look at, understand, or deal with the individual in the family except in the context of his total family relationship. This realization has come because for whatever reason a different attitude has developed about family associations — the companionship approach rather than the strict segregation of roles that was truer in the last century and earlier. We're seeing, I'm sure, a move in the direction of providing many more family activities. One could draw almost innumerable instances of the way in which this has been done. The Museum of Modern Art, of all places, provides activity that is limited to parents and children together. The City College of New York in some of its extension work in community activities, provides art and craft activities limited to groups of parents and children. In some of our public schools adult education programs there are astronomy groups, painting groups and discussion groups that are for family groups only. This has come about because it has seemed to be a natural, normal development, not because of some prophetic individual who is bucking the tide.

This sort of development, this increased appreciation of family life has pervaded our society far more deeply than many of us realize.

If we can only see how we can give guidance, direction, richness to these kinds of things, the tide is with us in a very real sense, in a way that perhaps we haven't felt it has been in the past. We haven't realized either how much of — I won't say knowledge — but how much feeling for basic mental health has pervaded the total population. Perhaps the positive note is being struck too strongly but I am impressed more and more with how much effect our increasingly effective mass media of communication in the family life field is having. Recently Mrs. Gruenberg gave one interesting illustration of this. On a trip back from the coast she was interested in what was happening in family groups aboard her train and saw one five-year-old leave his seat to watch a mother who was feeding a youngster of some seven or eight months of age. The infant was objecting a bit to the particular kind of strained food that he was being fed. The five-year-old stood very interested and then said in a very adult way, "You know you mustn't force him to eat."

Those working with parents at many economic, social and educational levels seem to agree that we have pretty good evidence that at least a basic matrix of understanding, though not always easily verbalized, has developed. This introduces the whole question of our relationship as experts with families. Some of us have been concerned about the anti-expert attitude that some of our confreres have been emphasizing. This attack, even though I can't agree with it completely, is a very good one for us to look at and may point to the ways in which those of us in the various person-serving professions should examine our methods and materials in parent and family life education so as to be certain we help rather than hinder satisfying family living. With all the difficulties we have, with all of the scare-heads about things that are affecting family life, we are facing in years ahead a kind of situation that is pregnant with possibilities for the sort of richness in family living that many of us have dreamed about for years.

OSKAR STONOROV\*

Why should an architect participate in this discussion? My province is within the scope of the discussions here but as a primitive architect I act outside the charmed circle of those initiated in the practice of social sciences. Thus, impatient for results and physical realizations as my profession compels me to be, I shall endeavor to paint in broad strokes the challenge of our national economy in regards to housing and community planning and the fate of families as I see the high powered drive of our economy threatening perhaps too little and too late the world situation in education and social research. My qualifica-

\* Dr. Stonorov is an architect and is located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

tions to do this are a family, a number of children and the experience of sitting isolated in the country and in 10 or 15 short years watching that thing that we call the city engulf myself and my acres.

Last summer Larry Frank and I participated in 10 days of discussions among 22 people on "Man and the City," essentially the same subject. Among ten people we discussed this multi-faceted subject this morning for three hours. Again, why have I been invited as an architect to say a number of things on family housing and the family? Perhaps because physical aspects are often as overlooked as they are obvious. Look at a few facts; houses have become smaller; they must again become larger; they have become safer but from a total disregard for family living and now builders are beginning to pay attention to the requirements of family living. Some years ago some of us participated in a conference in which certain concepts were developed and the very words "houses for family living" were coined, words that builders across the country have been using ever since to sell their wares. One concept was born during those months, the extra room, we called it the post-war extra dividend room. In the American builder's ranch house that extra family room today is a selling point without which he could not sell the little house. If we did nothing else, we emphasized the family house, the family room, as a result of our consideration of what I have been calling ever since "the battle for the possession of the house" between the parents and the teenagers as the family grows. If nothing had come out of that conference but the acquisition, by people, through builders, of that family room I think it would have sufficed. That is a very practical thing which ought to be continued, focusing attention on the need of families for the new facilities which we do not now know of, to emphasize the social intercourse that neighborhood living and family living in cities and suburbs require.

It interests me that the psychiatric fraternity until recently gave very very little attention to a house plan as a source of family trouble. It goes back to whether the family battle for possession of the house can be successfully fought in the house with dimensions of 24 x 32 feet in which the average American family lives today or whether other facilities are needed to protect its integrity. We talked this morning of the possible need for a cave in each house, not a physical cave underneath it but a place within the house to which one or two or three members of the family can retire and escape the many activities that must be carried on in that small house.

Every moment in our lives is historical but this one seems to me really especially important. We are somewhere in the mid-passage between two civilizations, one that we have outlived and one that is about to start in America. Yesterday, somebody spoke about the hierarchy of values — before we can establish this hierarchy of values we may well consider the real evaluation of values. At this important



moment we stand at the threshold of a much advertised age of abundance and richness and question whether we have a working hypothesis with which to cope with the problems that age will bring. Let us look at the potential of our technology as a reality — not whether it is desirable. It's going to happen so let's think in terms of the things that are on the way and in terms of the protections that we must create for the family to withstand the strain of things to come.

Today almost 75 percent of all people live in metropolitan areas, areas having more than 100,000 population. Twenty or twenty-five years ago, instead of 75 percent the figure was just a bit over 50 percent. Meanwhile, the population has been increased by 20 million. We have today well over 100 million people living in these metropolitan areas.

Now, a terrific force is developing to de-centralize all big cities. We face making decisions of whether big cities are desirable — it rests upon the voting population of this country to make such decisions. Ten years ago the last world war ended and in those years we have accomplished the five-day work week; by 1965 we are told we will have a four-day week. Then, we will have the possibility of going away for three days of each seven. The two house family — we have talked about the two car family — the two house family is around the corner. The fishing or vacation cottage fully equipped will be financed as easily as your car is being financed today. Population growth, to me this is a very healthy sign, is almost more rapid than our annual increase in production, which accounts for our tremendous ability to consume and thus for the kind of prosperity we are having.

The foregoing points, I'm fully aware, involve many inner conflicts and create, even while things are developing, a strange dichotomy of ugly cities and expanding dormitory suburbs in which attractiveness is being kept. To what do we need to gear our thinking, in dealing with such tremendous policies? I feel that we must keep consideration of the trend of this big overall panorama in constant harmony with the details of it. The details are "one family in one house," with children going to school, with people worshiping in a church, with children and adults going to museums, and all the other things they do.

What is necessary to safeguard a sane approach to protecting families and individuals from the overriding necessity of national economic planning which is with us today. Ideas are being born daily which in a very few years will be in full swing. I would like to emphasize one single remark which brings this into focus. The housing administrator a week ago in New Orleans said: "Watch out. If you don't plan for the biggest amount of activity to save the center of your cities by those devices that we're beginning to have, your cities will be bankrupt in 1965." Now, this is more than a political state-



ment. To counter overriding necessities for national planning we must have more citizen participation on the local level in the activities of all the agencies of our cities which are dealing with the problems of metropolitan growth. Every speaker in this Symposium has tried to emphasize that every child is unique, that every family is unique. I believe that every city is unique, and every reason is unique. We must cultivate this recognition, I would almost say, this provincialism. We must cultivate it because this kind of provincialism is the only guarantee of democratic participation to protect the interests of the families in cities and regions. We must be as provincial locally as we should be urbane on the world level.

I mentioned the improvement of plans. Builders make plans and they think they know what people need — only after they've been hit over the head will they recognize that they don't know it all. How do we know what people need? I don't think that you can ask people who live in bad houses or people who never have used soap which one of two different soaps is the better one. The consensus of many experts or research or the inquiry made by many people within their own spheres of activity, perhaps as a continuous activity under the auspices of some foundation, might help the production of the kind of houses that are necessary to protect the family.

We must inquire into some of the fringes of our problems. I say that guardedly because in this total picture such things as public housing are only fringe elements, yet public housing in its faults and its advantages has become an extreme pattern. After our experiences in the last 20 years ought we not be mature enough at this moment to recognize that we have been doing a great deal of damage and we should not continue to create living anti-democratic examples of a stigma for families and children. In our democracy is this not a very very severe attempt to ghettoize important sections of our population permanently? Would it not be much better to make it possible for these people living in public housing projects to mature into owners of their own houses or apartments in a cooperative way or in any other financial way by which once they could afford it they would pay economic rents rather than face being evicted because they make too much money. That seems to me a very strange way of encouraging individual initiative. If at the end of your struggle you find yourself where you started — you come out of the slums; you are taken into a perfectly beautiful place to live; then, if you have over-reached yourself in earning capacity, you are thrown back into the slums. That's exactly what we're going to do. I have wanted to introduce this situation as a very practical area in which we can show our concern for very distinctive parts of our society and for which we have attempted a rescue operation in the interest of all living in our communities and also as a measure of national prosperity.

## THE MERRILL-PALMER SCHOOL'S POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE EFFECTIVE FAMILY OF THE FUTURE

PAULINE PARK WILSON KNAPP\*

We appreciate your having come to join with us in this, our Thirty-Fifth Anniversary, when we could take the time to pause and focus our thinking on the family, not only of today but of tomorrow. Education for a better world community by helping people improve the quality of their human relations, particularly within the family which is such a potent and continuing factor in the life of every individual, has long been the goal of The Merrill-Palmer School. Our concern is for the family.

During the past two and one-half days we have enjoyed some excellent addresses, stimulating presentations and thought-provoking discussions by our distinguished speakers and leaders. We have had ideas brought out, new ones advanced, and some challenged. We have had many questions answered, other raised, and still others in the process of being formulated. This last day of the Symposium has been one in which we have pulled together the contributions from all participants and directed our thinking toward the future. My task in closing the Symposium is to do this insofar as is possible for the Merrill-Palmer School. One must approach such a task with temerity and humility, but also with faith and courage as did the first staff of the School, Director and Boards. To develop these potentials fully this afternoon would be an impossible task because one of its greatest potentials is its dynamic quality.

I believe that one of the School's real potentials is just what we have been doing here today, that is, bringing together people who can think together in working toward these goals which the school holds and which our friends and co-workers also hold.

Another of our potentials is being able to broaden the base of the School's program to meet the changing needs of people and of the times. For instance, the School was started for girls, yet in the beginning not only girls but also boys were admitted to the nursery school. The staff consisted not only of women but also of men. A few years later the base of the school was broadened to include men — undergraduates, then graduates, and finally extended to include adults,

\* Director, the Merrill-Palmer School.

both men and women. Starting with the preschool laboratory the School has increased its laboratory facilities and services to encompass the entire family cycle.

The number of disciplines and professions involved has been increased and should continue to increase. Psychologists, sociologists, nursery school teachers, home economists, lawyers, doctors, ministers, social workers and teachers — one by one through the years they have been drawn into the school. Again, one of our potentials is to make use of professions and disciplines and fields of specialization not now seeing themselves as contributing to families and individuals, but who really do and who must contribute. In reverse, the School can help interpret family and individual needs to members of professions and groups who do not always understand basic human needs, no matter how skilled they may be in their own fields.

The School has a vast potential in continuing to seek, to explore, and to try out new and creative ways of understanding people and helping families become increasingly effective. Being creative, spontaneous, and imaginative — we must be careful never to confuse these with being superficial, inaccurate, and careless. Being thorough, careful, and scientific should not be confused with being rigid, static, and resistant to change.

We must plan on a long-range basis so that we can take the preventive approach rather than being forced to approach human needs through correction and treatment. Seeing normal growth and development is the one sure path to a preventive approach, as is learning better to understand the uniqueness of each individual child and, at the same time, to understand his wholeness, his total experience. Our concern is not merely the child; it is the child and the family in relation to all other things. Characteristic of the School's potential is an unusual opportunity to affect attitudes about the wholeness of people and the importance of the individual, to affect attitudes about understanding and accepting one's self and then understanding and accepting others.

This opportunity to affect attitudes is furthered by our having students who come from many different kinds of institutions in many different parts of the world, and of serving families scattered through all parts of the Detroit area. Leaders who come to The Merrill-Palmer School subsequently go to many other communities and affect people far beyond the environs of this country. One of our former students from India said: "I didn't want to go home before I had my experience at Merrill-Palmer; after I had it I did want to go home because I saw much more clearly myself and my own world. I had an understanding and acceptance of myself as I've never had before, and also a better understanding of the people with whom I live."

Another potential of the School is our having freedom without surrendering our integrity to any pressure or bias, but seeking ways to increase knowledge and to apply it for the betterment of all individuals and families. With freedom always comes responsibility — in this case the responsibility to continue the unique role of leadership which Merrill-Palmer has in the community through its services and its educational programs.

The development of the program will be, and I think always has been, shaped in response to the awareness of the needs of the people we serve. Never will we have a set curriculum at Merrill-Palmer, any more than we have set plans, because it is this dynamic quality of moving on, of changing and adapting the program to meet the needs of the people with whom we work, that really represents Merrill-Palmer's greatest contribution.

Now underlying all of this teaching and service there must be a thorough-going, continuing research program. Our constant need to know more, our repeated need to find solutions, our steady need to test, and the need that individual staff members have for increasing their own understanding, remain one of the potentials which can be developed and met only through research. Communication of our results through publications both for professional people and for families throughout the country is obligatory.

The greatest potential of the school is the staff. The staff of the school *is* the school. To realize The Merrill-Palmer School's potential will require continuously the combined efforts of families, staff, boards, alumni, students, cooperating institutions, community friends and professional co-workers. We need to work together in carrying out in the years ahead the persistent idea contributed by the founder of Merrill-Palmer thirty-five years ago.

LY

ut  
ys  
li-  
in  
ip  
nd

as  
le  
ny  
of  
ds  
ll-

a  
to  
to  
ng  
oe  
ur  
or

ne  
al  
ls,  
ad  
ut  
of